
THE SOUTH AFRICAN ANAPHORA

The development of the Anaphora of the South African
Eucharistic Rite 1870 - 1929.

by

Peter Bingham Hinchliff
M.A.(Oxon.), B.A.(S.Africa.),
Associate in the Faculty of Divinity of the Church of the
Province of South Africa,
Subwarden of Saint Paul's College, Grahamstown, S.Africa.

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
the Department of Divinity at Rhodes University, Grahamstown.

Summary of Contents

Chapter I: The Beginnings of Revision.

The Book of Common Prayer originally in South Africa at the time of the first British occupation of the Colony in 1795. The privileged position of the Dutch Reformed Church not initially affected. After the second occupation of 1806 the Anglican Church gradually recognised as the 'Established Church'. Robert Gray appointed first bishop for the Cape under Letters Patent from the Crown. (1845). The anomalies of establishment. The Colenso case. The Long case. Privy Council judgements in these cases. Effects of the judgements. The Church declared disestablished. First Provincial Synod in South Africa - 1870. The Constitution of the Province and the Privy Council - the 'Third Proviso'. Merriman v. Williams - the Church of the Province declared not to be the 'Church of England in South Africa'. Disestablishment and Privy Council judgements as a reason for caution in matters of revision. The steps first taken to revise the Book of 1662. Provincial Synod of 1870 and liturgical revision. Schedule of permitted modifications issued by Episcopal Synod in 1911. Influence of the Revd. W.H. Frere, D.D. - Some Principles of Liturgical Reform. Scheme to combine matins, litany and communion service. Proposals for the Revision of the Anaphora published by the Revd. J.S. Bazeley and the Revd. C.J.E. Gould in 1913. Brief biographical notes on Bazeley and Gould - neither likely to adopt a conservative attitude to the Book of Common Prayer. The origins of Proposals and the genesis of the 'Grahamstown Group' - Dr. Phelps later bishop of Grahamstown and convener of the Liturgical Committee. Reactions to Proposals. New schedule of permitted modifications issued by the bishops in 1915 - no real advance upon 1911. The position in 1915.

Chapter II: Proposals For the Revision of the Anaphora.

Consideration in detail of the pamphlet by Bazeley and Gould. Influence of the Revd. W.C. Bishop. Bishop's article - The Primitive Form of Consecration. Argument of the article. Reconstruction of the primitive anaphora - its universality - scheme of thanksgivings for all God's saving work - blessing originally equivalent of thanksgiving. - other features of modern anaphoras (invocation & words of institution) introduced into earlier scheme - consideration of early invocations. An estimate of Bishop's argument. Views of modern scholarship. Lietzmann's hypothesis compared with Bishop's. Influence of Bishop's article upon Proposals. Summary of the argument of latter pamphlet. - Jewish blessings are thanksgivings - primitive anaphoras typified by the pattern of the anaphora in

the Apostolic Constitutions, Book VIII - pattern consists of thanksgivings arranged in logical order - consideration of early invocations - practical suggestions for revision. Consideration of the anaphora appended to Proposals. Some estimate of the style of the anaphora. Its sources. Frere's view of its value. Gallican features of this anaphora. Only one phrase of the anaphora in final South African rite. Words of administration same as present South African form. Means by which this became incorporated in final form. Reference to the proposed Grahamstown pro-anaphora. Influence of Bishop's hypothesis upon South African revision. Thanksgiving and logical order consistent principles of revisers. Estimate of the contribution of Bazeley and Gould.

Chapter III: The Making of the Proposed Form of 1916. Letter from Bazeley and Gould in reply to criticisms of Proposals. Modification of their views on revision. Revival of interest in Proposals and in liturgical matters generally. Various attitudes in Province to revision. Revision not to be local - fear that revision might separate Province from Church of England. 'Enrichment' rather than revision desired by some. Others desiring some closer approximation to the pattern of the Roman mass. Influence of the 'Grahamstown group' - Phelps now bishop of Grahamstown. Phelps's proposal in the Episcopal Synod of 1916. Gould's article Revision of the Eucharistic Canon in Church Chronicle; later reprinted in pamphlet form. Its influence upon the Sacred Synod of the diocese of Grahamstown in 1917. Resolution of this Synod requesting the bishops to proceed with revision in accordance with general principles of Proposals. Resolution of Episcopal Synod of 1917 consequent upon this request. Archbishop Carter's doubts as to the wisdom of revision. Publication of the Proposed Form. The Form sent, with Report No. 504 of the Convocation of Canterbury, to the chapters of the dioceses in South Africa. Comments from chapters. Analysis of the shape and contents of the Proposed Form. Considerable influence of Gould upon it. Preface to the Form - much evidence of the effects of W.C. Bishop's hypothesis.

Chapter IV: The First Alternative Form of 1919. Frere's memorandum to the South African bishops - Rough Notes on the Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy. Argument of the memorandum with special attention to Frere's suggestions for a form of invocation. Leckton's review of the Proposed Form in Church Quarterly Review - much less favourably disposed than Frere. Pretoria Committee report on Proposed Form and Convocation Report No. 504. Reports from the chapters of the dioceses of Cape Town, Grahamstown and St. John's. Some discussion of Pretoria report - much the most detailed of all the reports. Later influence of Pretoria report. Publication of Alternative Form of 1919 - Frere's memorandum the source of almost all the new additions. Consideration of the preface to the Form. Argument of the preface - need for reform - thanksgiving and logical order stressed. Phelps probably author of the preface. Influence of W.C. Bishop clearly evidenced by ideas expressed in preface. Frere's review of Alternative Form. Rubric providing for supplementary consecration. Difficulties raised by rubric. Frere's criticisms of. Some remarks on the method and machinery used in revision. Respective parts played by Liturgical Committee, Episcopal Synod and Provincial Synod.

Chapter V: The 'Epiklesis Controversy' Attacks upon the invocation of the 1919 Form. These based on assumption that invocation follows upon an already

completed 'Western' form of consecration (i.e. they maintained that the Anglican rites defined the words of institution as 'moment of consecration') Criticism of the Alternative Form from the diocese of St John's. Publication of 1919 Form makes matter public. Criticism of the Form by Dean Hulme of Bloemfontein. Hulme's curious interpretation of the invocation. The 'Bloemfontein use'. The plain meaning of the 1919 invocation. The term 'oblation'. Resolutions of Provincial Synod 1919. General approval for the Form by a narrow majority. Request for further consideration to be given to details of Form. The election of assessors to consult with the bishops. Estimate of influence of assessors. Details of revision for 1920. The contemporary position in England - the English revision of 1927/8 too late to influence South African Form. South African bishops' desire to have Form confirmed by second consecutive session of Provincial Synod - therefore initially unwilling to make material alterations to it. Further criticism of the Form from Grahamstown. The appearance of the Revd. J.T.Darragh, D.D., as a leading opponent of the Form. Darragh's character. The Natal petition against the invocation - 1920. Darragh's Considerations attached to the petition. Argument of Considerations:- consecration must follow either Eastern or Western form - no third form possible; rubric on supplementary consecration makes South African Form Western - invocation is, therefore, out of place - argument from the Scottish rite - argument from the manual acts of 1662. Value of Darragh's argument assessed. Views of Anglican liturgists. Episcopal Synod returns Form to Liturgical Committee for further consideration. Darragh's controversy with Frere about invocation. Similar controversy between bishop Nash of Cape Town and the Revd. M.C.Hodson of Natal. Cape Town petition against invocation. Influence of the Revd. Fr. Bull, S.S.J.B. Publication of the Pretoria 'draft-rite'. The anaphora of the Pretoria draft. Weight of various objections to the Alternative Form. Compromise decision of Episcopal Synod in 1921. Statement by bishops on 'theology of consecration'. Influence of W.C.Bishop's hypothesis on this statement. Some estimate of the continued influence of Eazeley and Gould after the publication of Proposals. Inconclusive nature of the evidence for this.

Chapter VI: The final stages.

The publication of the Natal 'draft-rite'. Work of same body as Natal petition. Considerable modification of view expressed in Darragh's Considerations. The anaphora of the Natal rite. The experimental Alternative Form issued by Episcopal Synod in 1922. Influence of 'Western' ideas. Form rescinded in 1923 and replaced by final form of 1924. Proposal to send Forms of 1922 and 1923 to the 'Lambeth' committee of liturgical experts. No evidence of their being sent; no evidence of answer received before final ratification of rite. Provincial Synod of 1924- Form approved without discussion. Liturgy fixed. Later criticisms of the 1924 Form.

Tendencies present in South African revision - uniformity, conservatism, idealism. History of revision summarised. Influence of W.C.Bishop, Frere, Western rites. Criticisms of the South African form as 'muddled'. The theology of the bishops examined. W.C.Bishop's hypothesis traced through Eazeley and Gould, Phelps, Liturgical Committee, and Episcopal Synod to Provincial Synod. Objections to this view considered. The real meaning of the present rubric on supplementary consecration. The bishops' view of the rite as 'sacrifice.' The South African rite deliberately intended to reflect same 'theology of consecration'

as W.C.Bishop maintained was to be found in all primitive anaphoras.

Appendices.

- 1)The Text of the Anaphora of the Proposals of 1913.
- 2)The Text of the Anaphora of the Proposed Form of 1918.
- 3)The Text of the Anaphora of the Alternative Form of 1919.
- 4)The Text of the Anaphora of the Pretoria Draft Rite of 1921.
- 5)The Text of the Anaphora of the Natal Draft Rite of 1921.
- 6)The Text of the Anaphora of the Alternative Form of 1924.
- 7) (a) A List of the Principal Collections of Documents relating to the history of the South African Eucharistic Rite.
(b) Note - The Present State of the Documentary Evidence.
- 8)Bibliography.

NOTE.

The following abbreviations are used in the text of the thesis;

Alternative Form	- An Alternative Form of the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion. (various editions, 1919 - 1929)
A.C.VIII.	- Apostolic Constitutions, Book VIII.
Considerations	- Considerations bearing on the Petition to the Episcopal Synod, addressed to the Lord Bishop of Natal.
Constitution & Canons	- The Constitution and Canons of the Church of the Province of South Africa. (various editions, 1870 - 1950)
C.Q.R.	- Church Quarterly Review.
Historical Records	- The Historical Records of the Church of the Province of South Africa, compiled by C.Lewis and G.E.Edwards.
Proposals	- Proposals for the Revision of the Anaphora, by J.S.Bazeley and C.J.B.Gould.
Proposed Form	- The Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy.

N.B. The editions of the alternative South African Liturgy are always referred to by the date of publication, which is usually, but not always, the year following that in which the edition was approved by Episcopal Synod.

Chapter One

The Prayer Book of the Church of England reached South Africa as a part of the establishment of a British Administration at the Cape. In its new environment it obviously required some revision. The Book of 1662 reflected the political and social conditions of its time. It was designed for a Church not immediately concerned with missionary work amongst heathen peoples but directly established under the Crown. The circumstances of a Church in the colonies, particularly when the colonies became self-governing, required some modernisation of language, some omission and adaptation of old prayers and some addition of new ones. Yet the Church appears to have been wary of attempting anything more than this, and it was especially reluctant to make any revision which might imply a doctrinal change. The consecration prayer in the liturgy - 'our incomparable liturgy' - was particularly sacrosanct by virtue of long use and the accretion of sentimental associations. Revision of this part of the book would naturally be slow and hesitant, and this is the revision with which we are concerned, - the most interesting and important part of the history of the South African Prayer Book. It cannot be divorced, of course, from the wider setting of the whole process of revision, but must be seen as part of it. This chapter is concerned with the circumstances of the first slow steps in revision, and deals not so much with the anaphora itself, as with the eucharistic rite in general. Partly this is owing to the fact that the first conservative moves towards a new Prayer Book left the anaphora untouched, but partly also to the fact that revision of the anaphora can only be seen in a proper perspective against the history of the Church in South Africa as a whole.

From the start, though their action required confirmation by Provincial Synod¹, the initiative lay with the bishops of the Province. This is a significant fact, since those responsible for the government of the Church are not likely to be revolutionary in their attitude to anything. The South African bishops, in particular, were conservative and not revolutionary because of the tragic complex of litigation which surrounded the origins of a separate province of the Anglican Church in this country. It is a part of our history of which we are not proud, but nevertheless an important one, and an understanding of these events is essential to an appreciation of the history of revision. Most of the relevant information is available in The Historical Records of the Church of the Province of South Africa, compiled by Cecil Lewis and G.E. Edwards and to be cited hereafter simply as Historical Records. Yet the story is nowhere set out in one straightforward, coherent and easily accessible account.

The history of the province begins with the first British occupation of the Cape of 1795 - 1803. Nominally the British Government acted with the consent of and on behalf of the Prince of Orange, and the occupation was a temporary one, ending with the Peace of Amiens. During the period of the occupation the Dutch Reformed Church remained virtually the 'established' Church, though it was not strictly a 'state' Church since the colony was never directly administered by a Dutch government until 1803² when Britain relinquished control to the puppet Batavian Republic. In

1. Constitution and Canons (1870); Article X. - printed in pamphlet form by William Foster of Cape Town. The most recent edition of Constitution and Canons (1950) remains substantially unaltered as regards the constitution, and footnotes to the text indicate such changes as have been made since 1870, with the date of amendment.

2. Historical Records, p.5. Before the occupation the colony was administered by the Dutch East India Company.

1806, on the renewal of hostilities with France, Britain again seized control of the Cape and, as in 1795, the Church of England, in the persons of civil and military chaplains, appeared in the wake of British colonial administration. Initially the privileged position of the Dutch Church was not much affected, but by slow degrees, and particularly after the Cape was finally ceded to Great Britain in 1815, the Church of England assumed the position of a state Church, as by law established.¹

The Church of England in the colony cannot have been an inspiring body.² The civil chaplains, like their military counterparts, were appointed by a department of the state,³ and they held a privileged position. The Governor as commander-in-chief controlled military chaplains. As the person exercising all the ecclesiastical prerogatives of an ordinary, he controlled the civil chaplains also.⁴ There was no bishop at first to exercise ordinary jurisdiction, and such episcopal functions as were performed in the first half of the nineteenth century were those undertaken by visiting bishops on their way to or from India. One such visitor, bishop Wilson of Calcutta, made a most depressing report upon the condition of the Church in the Cape.⁵

The first bishop for the Cape was appointed, significantly by Letters Patent from the Queen, in the normal course of the administration of the Established Church. The Letters Patent nominated Robert Gray as Lord Bishop⁶ of Cape Town and defined his diocese as 'the Cape of Good Hope and its dependencies, with the Island of St Helena.'⁷

1. For an outline of how this happened see Lowther Clarke - Constitutional Church Government, pp. 320 ff.

2. Metrowich - Assegal Over the Hills (a badly written and undocumented book) gives a picture of the establishment - pp. 30ff.

3. C. Gray - Life of Robert Gray, Vol. I. p. 171.

4. Historical Records, p. 20.

5. Ibid., p. 21.

6. Gray was specifically designated 'Lord Bishop' in the Patent, presumably as a title of courtesy. The custom of so designating bishops has continued in the Province, even in official ecclesiastical documents.

7. Historical Records, p. 31.

The state of affairs in this new diocese, when Gray came to it, cannot have been satisfactory. The governor relinquished ordinary jurisdiction to the new bishop, but civil chaplains continued to exist and to be appointed by the government.¹ The Church's control of its places of worship, where these existed, was both tenuous and complicated. Some had originally been garrison chapels, built and owned by the army. Some stood on land granted to the Church by the governor on behalf of the Crown as the head of the establishment. Some, like Gray's own metropolitanical church in Cape Town, represented the capital investment of a joint-stock company paying its dividends from the pew rents.² A few had been built and endowed by private persons; others by subscriptions from the faithful. All told there were not many church buildings and they were widely scattered. They passed in the end, through the generosity of government, shareholders (some of whom were not even Christians), and private individuals, into the control of the Church, but at the time of Gray's arrival the question of ownership was far from clear.

These were complications inherent in establishment; yet no one seems to have doubted that the Anglican Church in this country was in some sense established.³ The Church was, as it were, a part of the British system of government. There arose very early, however, a series of events which very seriously called in question the position of the Church in South Africa. Out of the tangle of disagreement, tension, and distress which marked the disestablishment of the Church, three law-suits may be easily distinguished as of the first importance. The first concerned the position of the bishop of Cape Town as metropolitan, the second his

1. C. Gray - Life of Robert Gray, loc.cit.

2. Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 162 - 165, quoting from letters of bishop Gray.

3. Lowther Clarke - Constitutional Church Government, p. 220

right to summon synods, and the third the Church's right to own property. Without metropolitan, synod or property, the Church could hardly have continued to exist, except as a department of the state or as an extension of the Province of Canterbury.

In 1847 Gray received the Letters Patent already referred to. In July 1853 the Cape Colony was granted Representative Government, which meant a considerable modification of the prerogative rights of the Crown within the Colony. On November 23rd of that year, after Gray had arranged for the division of his original diocese into three parts, Letters Patent were issued to John William Colenso, as bishop of Natal, and to John Armstrong, as bishop of Grahamstown.¹ Gray received his second Letters Patent as bishop of a reduced diocese of Cape Town and as metropolitan, a fortnight later.² Bishop Gray later denied that he had ever 'resigned' his first Letters Patent.³ At all events, these dates were of considerable importance in the controversy that later centred round the personalities of Gray and Colenso. It could be, and was, held that after July 1853 the Crown could no longer appoint bishops for the Cape by means of Letters Patent. It could also be held that at the time of Colenso's appointment as bishop of Natal no such office as that of metropolitan existed. This was maintained⁴ in spite of the fact that Colenso took an oath

1. Historical Records p.66

2. Ibid.

3. A Statement in connexion with the Consecration, Trial, and Excommunication of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Colenso by the Bishop of Cape Town (Rivingtons. 2nd. Ed. 1867) p.4.

4. The judgement of the Privy Council is given in extenso in C.Gray.-Life of Bishop Gray Vol II pp.64lff. NB. pp644f and p.648.

of obedience to Gray at the time of his consecration and again after Gray's second Letters Patent had been issued. Finally it could be argued that Robert Gray, lord bishop of Cape Town under the first Letters Patent was not the same person at law as Robert Gray, lord bishop of Cape Town under the second Letters Patent.

In 1857 bishop Gray summoned his first Diocesan Synod.¹ A clergyman named Long refused to recognise the validity of the summons, holding that synods were contrary to the laws and customs of the Church of England.² Exactly the same thing happened again in 1861,³ and, eventually, after he had been deprived of his office for contumacy by bishop Gray, Long applied to the Supreme Court of the Colony for an interdict to prevent the bishop from carrying out the sentence. When Gray came to show cause in the Court, why the decree should not be made absolute, the Court ruled in the bishop's favour.⁴ Already, however, it was being made clear that there were all sorts of anomalies inherent in the very existence of a Church 'of England' in some other country. Long appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; but their judgement was not given until after the Colenso affair had become a vital issue.

Colenso was deposed to Gray for heresy in 1861 and again in 1862.⁵ Gray consulted the Archbishop of Canterbury. The English bishops, while condemning Colenso's Commentary on Romans, felt unable to proceed against a bishop "belonging to

1. Historical Records, pp. 69 & 146

2. C.Gray - Life of Bishop Gray Vol. I. p. 419.

3. C.Gray op.cit., Vol. I. pp. 472ff.

4. Historical Records, pp. 151 - 155.

5. The details of Colenso's teaching are not relevant here. They are given in Historical Records, pp. 161ff. See also A.T. Wirgman - Life of James Green (A partisan account) chapters 2, 3 & 5. (For comment on Wirgman as author and scholar, in another, though related context, see Church Quarterly Review, April, 1897 p.92.)

a distant jurisdiction".¹ Gray proceeded in 1863 to cite Colenso to appear before him in the Metropolitan's Court². Colenso, who did not appear in person, appealed from Gray's sentence³ to the Privy Council. Colenso appealed on the ground that Gray had no jurisdiction over him.⁴ This was the same year that the Privy Council gave its judgement in the Long case.(1863). In the Long case the Privy Council had held⁵ that Gray's second Letters Patent had never been valid, since they had been issued after the establishment of constitutional government at the Cape, and that his original Letters had ceased to be effective when the Diocese was divided. Gray, therefore, could have no such coercive jurisdiction as an English diocesan would have had, and his authority was limited to that which the members of the Church, as a voluntary association, were willing to allow him to exercise. The judgement in effect gave Long the use and control of the property of the church at which he was ministering, but could not compel the bishop to license him to the cure of souls there.⁶

Two years after this, in 1865, the Privy Council also pronounced judgement in the Colenso case.⁷ Here its findings were that the Crown could not make Gray metropolitan by Letters Patent; that unless Colenso was willing to accept Gray's authority, Gray could have none over him, since the office of metropolitan had not existed at the time when Colenso was made bishop; and that there was no way, in law, in which Gray could inhibit Colenso. Colenso eventually, also by litigation, secured possession of Church

1. Historical Records pp. 167.

2. C.Gray-op.cit., Vol.II. pp.591ff.

3. For the text of the sentence see C.Gray-op.cit., Vol.II.p.638ff.

4. Historical Records pp. 169f.

5. Text in C.Gray-op.cit., Vol.II. pp.577ff.

6. Historical Records pp. 155 - 7.

7. Text in C.Gray-op.cit., Vol.II. pp.641ff. and see Historical Records, pp. 171ff.

property in Natal and of his salary from the Colonial Bishops' Fund.¹ So, almost by accident, the tiny Anglican Church in South Africa found itself disestablished; and it found itself, also, deeply divided by schism. If it could no longer be governed by bishops appointed by the Crown, it must have some other means of appointing them.² In 1866, the year after the final Colenso judgement, Gray summoned a Provincial Conference to prepare the way for the setting up of the Provincial Synod, the supreme legislative body of the Church in South Africa.

Provincial Synod met for the first time in 1870.³ It drew up a constitution for the church, now to be known as the Church of the Province of South Africa. This constitution had been drafted by the bishops in Episcopal Synod in 1863, and was finally confirmed by Provincial Synod in 1876.⁴ At the time of the promulgation of the constitution it was only natural that the Privy Council should be regarded with some suspicion, not only on account of the special circumstances of the Long and Colenso judgements, but also because of the state of affairs in the Church in England. The position of ecclesiastical courts in England was obscure, and it was doubtful how far any of them could exercise an effective jurisdiction. The final court in ecclesiastical causes was the Privy Council, and a great many members of the Church of England had refused to regard its findings as binding upon the conscience.⁵ Prosecutions for ritualism, or more properly ceremonialism, gave the whole question a certain prominence and made clear the weakness of the system. Archbishop Tait, four years after the first session of Provincial Synod in

1. Historical Records, p.174.

2. Constitution and Canons (1870), p.5. (see note 1 to this chapter).

3. Historical Records pp.89ff.

4. Constitutions and Canons (1950) p.5

5. cf. recommendations of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in Bell - Randall Davidson p.471.

this country, tried to solve the problem by means of the Regulation of Public Worship Act.¹ It was in the atmosphere of the years immediately preceding the passage of this act, and immediately following upon the judgements of the Privy Council in the Long and Colenso cases, that the constitution of the Church of the Province was drawn up. Its terms reflect suspicion of the powers of the Privy Council in a very marked degree. The Preamble to the Constitution lays down that the standards of faith and worship are to be those of the Church of England. It is of importance to note that one of those standards is the Book of Common Prayer which the Church of the Province expressly 'receives' in the constitution, disclaiming the right to alter any such standards.² In spite of this express waiving of the right to alter the standards of the Church of England, including the Prayer Book, both the second Proviso (infra) and Article X of the Constitution clearly envisage the possibility of liturgical revision. Article X (q.v.) explicitly states that such revision shall conform to the spirit and teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. These apparently conflicting provisions in the constitution have resulted, in effect, in the production of a revised Prayer Book to be used as an alternative to and not as a substitute for the 1662 Book. After the preamble there follow the three Provisos. The first of these was inserted to enable the Church of the Province to accept any subsequent amendment that might be made to the formularies of the Church of England. The second makes similar provision for the Prayer Book, making it possible for the Church of the Province to accept any English

1. For the circumstances of the framing of this act; Davidson - Archibald Campbell Tait Chapters xxiv-xxvi.
2. Constitution and Canons (1950) pp.7f.

or Pan-Anglican revision. The third, and constitutionally most important, provides that the Church of the Province shall not be bound by the decisions of any tribunal other than its own ecclesiastical courts or such other courts as Provincial Synod may recognise.¹ In terms of this proviso, then, the decisions of the Judicial Committee are no more binding upon the province than upon any other non-established religious body within the Commonwealth.

The immediate effect of the third proviso was, at least in the eyes of the courts, to sever all legal connection between the Church of the Province and the Church of England. It was not long before this was made abundantly clear. In 1880 a suit was heard in the Supreme Court of the colony between bishop Merriman of Grahamstown and Williams, his dean. The bishop had deprived the dean, after citing him in his Diocesan Court, for violating the common law of the Church.² He then applied to the Supreme Court to enforce his sentence. The case turned upon the rights of a bishop of the Province over property belonging to the Church of England, i.e. over the cathedral in Grahamstown and over the dean as its rector.³ The court held, in the dean's favour, that a bishop appointed in terms of the constitution and not by Letters Patent could not be the legal successor and heir of a bishop appointed by Letters Patent.

The bishop appealed to the Privy Council. This is not as illogical as it sounds. He had applied to the Supreme Court of the colony to enforce by law the rules of the association (i.e. the Church) to which he and Williams both belonged.⁴ He afterwards appealed to the Privy Council, not as an inter-

1. Constitution & Canons (1950), pp. 8ff. Cf. Constitution of the Church of the Province of Central Africa. (N.B. Articles I & IV.) This very recent constitution contains nothing really comparable to the South African third proviso.

2. Historical Records p.176, cf. Wood - A Father in God for a full discussion (summarised in Lowther Clarke - Constitutional Church Government, pp. 344 ff.).

3. Historical Records, pp. 175 f.

4. Ibid., p.176.

preter of ecclesiastical law, but as the court of appeal in colonial causes.¹ The judgement of the Judicial Committee² assumes that the Church of England can exist outside England; but that, because of the third proviso, the Church of the Province cannot be that Church. The Privy Council also ruled that, although the Letters Patent of the earlier bishops were no longer effective and although Letters Patent could no longer be issued, yet those original Letters had created a corporation capable of holding property belonging to the Church 'of England' and not to the Church of the Province.³ In spite of the undeniable hardships which this judgement imposed upon the province, there is a sense in which it was the very thing the province had desired since the time of bishop Gray for it freed the Church from the anomalies inherent in establishment in the colonies.⁴

These original anomalies together with the tragic course of disestablishment had a surprising effect upon liturgical revision. One might have supposed that the Church, upon finding itself free to do what it liked, would have embarked upon an extensive revision of the Prayer Book. What actually happened was very different. We have seen that Provincial Synod in 1870 'received' the Book of Common Prayer. This book has remained the norm of public worship ever since, as is recognised by the preface to the revised South African book. So when, for instance, the bishops issued the Alternative Form of the Holy Communion⁵ in 1919,

1. See Wirgman - Storm and Sunshine in South Africa, p.125 & c.f. The Constitution, Acts & Resolutions of the Third Synod of the Diocese of Cape Town, (printed by order of the Synod by Saul Solomon & Co., Cape Town, 1865), pp. 12 & 13.

2. Historical Records, pp.178 f.

3. Ibid., pp.188 f.

4. Cf. Wirgman - Life of James Green, Vol. I. pp. 11 f.

5. An Alternative Form of the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion, (Grocott & Sherry, 1919) - Notes on the Revision - p.1.

they first took legal advice on their powers under the constitution to revise the Book of Common Prayer at all. Obviously the unpleasantness and unhappiness which had marked the discovery of disestablishment had made the bishops wary of doing anything which might further weaken the links between the province and the Church of England. Twice, indeed, in the twenty years following the judgment in the Merriman case, attempts were made to repeal the third proviso. In each case it was argued that the proviso separated the Church of the Province from the Church of England.¹ In the second attempt a further argument was advanced, that the repeal would help to heal the schism caused by the Colenso controversy. In this case the motion for repeal stood in the name of the son of the dean of Maritzburg who had first delated Colenso for heresy. In neither case was the attempt successful. It is nevertheless clear that as late as fifty years ago the relationship between the province and England was a live issue. There were many who felt that it ought to be a legal as well as a spiritual relationship. Indeed, a schism with its roots in the question of this relationship continues amongst Anglicans in this country to the present time. It must be remembered, moreover, that the first Lambeth Conference was not held until 1867. Even in the next decade or two the 'Anglican Communion' must have been an unfamiliar idea; a union based on tenuous and untested bonds.

Of all the links which remained to bind the province to the 'Mother Church' after 1880, the Prayer Book must have seemed the most real and the most obvious. When, for instance, the legislature of the colony of Natal was asked in 1910 to pass the Church Properties Act, another move towards healing the schism, the Book of 1662 was obviously regarded as a guarantee of the 'Anglicanism' of the Church

1. Historical Records, pp. 187 & 189.

of the Province. The act provided that in services conducted in buildings which had once belonged to the 'Church of England' and which might join the Church of the Province, nothing might be required which was not required in the services of the Church of England.¹ In 1924, when Provincial Synod agreed on the final form of the eucharistic liturgy, Synod desired to affirm;

its continued loyalty to the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper in the Book of Common Prayer, and to its use, where retained, as a sufficient and completely catholic rite, endeared to millions of churchmen by the most sacred associations.²

Even before this Episcopal Synod had, in 1911 and again in 1915, passed resolutions aimed at securing, as far as was within the power of the bishops of a single province, some measure of uniformity in matters of revision within the whole Anglican Communion. Prima facie one would expect to find the authorities reluctant to initiate any revision.

Yet there were compelling reasons for revision. It was 'in the air'.³ The constitution of 1870 had made provision for it, though it had not laid down any specific machinery to be used.⁴ Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1867 had laid down the conditions (probably reflected in the South African second proviso) that it was desirable for provinces to observe in revising the Prayer Book. Such revision, it was held, ought not to deviate from the doctrinal position of the 1662 book and ought to have due regard to the use of the book in the Anglican Communion as a whole. Subsequent conferences affirmed the right of provinces to revise the book and were willing to allow a certain measure of elasticity in Anglican worship.⁵ In England there was

1. Wood - A Father in God, p.235.

2. Constitution & Canons (1939), p.121. (Act XIX, s.3.)

3. Cf. para.1. of Notes on the Revision in An Alternative Form etc. (1919), p.1.

4. Constitution & Canons (1870), Article X.

5. See Lowther Clarke - Liturgy and Worship, pp. 783 ff. The provisions of Article X of the Constitution of the Province are in full accord with Article xxxiv of the xxxix Articles.

a similar desire for revision resulting in the Letters of Business issued to the Convocations in 1906. At first in South Africa the process was very slow. Such revision as was attempted in the Provincial Synod of 1870 was concerned only with adapting those parts of the 1662 Book which obviously could not be used in South Africa, as they stood.¹ The only change made in the eucharistic liturgy was far from startling. It was agreed that the Longer Exhortation might be omitted on all except four occasions in the year. Certain provision was also made for clergymen working in the Diocese of Bloemfontein (in the Republic of the Orange Free State) to omit references to the Queen from the prayers.² But the missionary responsibilities of the Church, alone, would have made revision essential.³ Something far more extensive in adapting the Book of Common Prayer to the practical political and social conditions of South Africa was inevitable. Slowly, reluctantly even, men ceased to regard the Prayer Book as possessing any verbal infallibility, and the first few hesitant steps towards revision were taken. At first these hardly affected the liturgy at all. In 1900 the celebrant was given permission to use both of the prayers, which in 1662 are alternatives, after the communion.⁴ In 1911 systematic revision was begun. By this time, of course, the English Convocations had received their Letters of Business of 1906⁵ and in that very year the English archbishops appointed an Advisory Committee on Liturgical Questions.⁶ It must have seemed to the South

1. Constitution & Canons (1870), pp44ff., repeated in Constitution and Canons (1939), pp160ff. The subsequent, and most recent edition (1950) no longer contains them since the publication of the final South African Prayer Book.

2. Constitution and Canons (1870) pp44f.

3. Messrs. Bazeley and Gould in their Proposals for the Revision of the Anaphora (to be discussed at length in Chapter Two) used the missionary work of the church as an urgent argument for revision (op.cit.p.11) cf 'Notes on the revision' in An Alternative Form etc. (1919) p.1.

4. Constitution and Canons (1939) p.163

5. R.C.D. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere p.3.

6. ibid p.26.

African bishops that they were moving ahead, slowly and comfortably, hand in hand with their brethren 'at home'.¹

In 1911 Episcopal Synod issued a schedule of permitted modifications of and additions to the 1662 Book. These are printed, but not in schedule form, in Constitution and Canons (1939), pp160ff. The original schedule was entitled Suggestions and Adaptations of Services². Here earlier changes allowed by Provincial and Episcopal Synods were brought together with certain new modifications, and issued on the authority of the bishops. The bishop of Pretoria, for instance, sent out with the schedule of 1911 a pastoral letter Ad Clerum³ containing detailed suggestions as to the actual conduct of services; but these referred to ceremonial and devotional rather than to liturgical matters. As touching the eucharist the 1911 schedule permitted the omission of the Decalogue⁴ and of the prayer for the King, provided that they were read once on Sundays. The form of administration might be shortened, provided that it was used once in its entirety.⁵ Certain additional collects, epistles, and gospels were provided, and there was also a scheme for combining matins, litany and the eucharist in one Sunday morning service. This last provision directed that matins should begin with 'O Lord, open thou our lips.' and continue to the Benedictus immediately followed by the second and third collects. Then came a hymn and the litany up to the Kyries, the Prayer of St.Chrysostom, the collect, epistle, and gospel for the day and the rest of the 1662 liturgy.⁶

1.Cf. 'Notes on the Revision' in An Alternative Form (1919), p.1.

2.Printed in 1911 - no printers' name.

3.Printed by the Transvaal Leader in 1912.

4.But curiously the bishops provided no alternative to be used when the Decalogue was omitted.

5.The shortened form to be used seems to have been left to the discretion of the bishop. In practice it usually took the form of the first half of the 1662 words of administration, as far as 'unto everlasting life'.

6.Constitution & Canons (1939) p.163.

The bishops' scheme for combining and shortening the three morning services is of particular interest because it follows exactly the pattern suggested by Dr W.H.Frere, C.R., later bishop of Truro, in Some Principles of Liturgical Reform.¹ Frere was anxious that one result of revision in England should be a compressed Sunday morning service, combining the Prayer Book scheme of matins, litany and holy communion in one rite more suited to the twentieth century.

The ideal of the [1662] Book is clear enough. Morning Prayer, followed by Litany and Communion Service, either continuously or separately, is the provision the Book makes; it is also the requirement which was actually laid upon the great churches and their clergy in the early days of the Prayer Book.² The main hindrance to the recovery of the ideal is the length of time required for the performance of the whole group of Sunday morning services in their present form.³

In addition to the compression of these three services, Frere desired a further re-arrangement of the existing prayers of the 1662 eucharistic rite. This re-arrangement placed the Comfortable Words, Prayer of Humble Access, Sursum Corda, Preface and Sanctus, Prayer of Consecration, Prayer of Oblation, and the Lord's Prayer in that order, linking the last three of these together to form a continuous canon.⁴

Frere's book was published in March 1911, and must have enjoyed a fairly wide popularity, for it had to be reprinted two months later. Episcopal Synod met later in the same year to issue the schedule of permitted modifications. According to the minutes of the Synod, the session was held in Maritzburg on the 7th and following days of October, 1911. It would surely allow too much to coincidence to suppose that two identical schemes for

1. Frere - op.cit. pp. 157 f.

2. Ibid., p. 151.

3. Ibid., p. 154.

4. Ibid., pp. 191 ff.

the compressed rite originated independently of each other in the course of the same year. The bishops differed from Frere in retaining the Prayer of St Chrysostom,¹ which rather spoilt the liturgical purity of the compressed form. Frere used the Kyries of the litany as those of the eucharist also.² The only other difference was that the bishops provided for the singing of hymns.³ Otherwise the two schemes agreed in detail, even to the places at which the salutation, 'The Lord be with you.', was to be inserted.⁴ It is hard to escape the impression that the schedule of 1911 was the result of Frere's book. Even if the bishops had not seen the book as finally published, they may have been in touch with Frere while he was preparing his work for publication. We know that they certainly turned to him for help at a later date.⁵ They may have done so at this stage. The bishops' manner of dealing with the conflation of the three morning offices is the most striking evidence because it is the least likely to have been the result of chance, but there are other indications also. Frere had advocated the omission of the Decalogue and the prayer for the King.⁶ He was anxious, too, to see provision made for additional collects, epistles, and gospels.⁷ Both these things were done in the schedule of 1911.⁸

If it is true that Frere's book influenced the bishops' schedule this may help to explain the later and quite undeniable influence which he exerted upon the alternative eucharistic rite of 1919, the first recorded instance

1. Constitution & Canons (1939), p.163.

2. Frere - Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, p.157.

3. Constitution & Canons (1939), p.163.

4. Ibid., and cf. Frere - op.cit., p.158.

5. This was in the preparation of the Alternative Form of 1919.

For Frere's suggestions see Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, pp.203f.

6. Frere - Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, pp.195.f.

7. Ibid., pp.196.f.

8. Constitution & Canons (1939), p.163.

of his advice being sought by the bishops. On that occasion Frere's influence was so overwhelming¹ as to be inexplicable unless one may assume some such prior contact as has been suggested here. Indeed it is not hard to see why the sort of revision for which Frere pleaded in Some Principles of Liturgical Reform should have commended itself to the South African bishops as they brought out their first tentative schedule. Frere was already, by 1911, a liturgologist of distinction, and he was deeply interested in the practical matters of Prayer Book revision. 1911 was the year in which he was appointed to the Advisory Committee on Liturgical Questions.² He was just the person to suit the governors of a Church which had been through the crises which had accompanied the birth of the Church of the Province. Not only was Frere a member of an official English body working on revision; his very arguments are those to which the bishops might be expected to give a favourable hearing. It is a fairly general opinion that the South African bishops were originally reluctant to move at all in revision. Frere begins Some Principles of Liturgical Reform by stressing the conservatism of the average worshipper and the need to move very slowly in making changes. This is just what we might expect the bishops to be glad to hear. Frere wrote;

In many parts of the world where the English Prayer Book is used, local and independent schemes of revision are already being undertaken. In some of these places it is, no doubt, desirable that the local scheme should come to maturity, because the local needs are sufficiently unlike our home needs to require a substantially different provision. In other parts, on the contrary, the undertaking is far less necessary; but is only the result of a natural impatience with the present unchangeableness of the Prayer Book. As regards many such areas a revised Prayer Book that would be suitable for England would be

1. See infra, pp. 101 ff.

2. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p. 26.

equally suitable there also; and where the work had been done at home, there would be no need for such places to prosecute an independent revision.¹

This is intended by Frere as an argument for 'unhalting revision' in England (a revision which need not be any the less conservative for being unhalting), but might equally well be taken to be an argument for halting revision elsewhere. Frere's approach, besides being so massively conservative, was also founded upon an acceptance of the Book of Common Prayer as a fundamentally sound and perfectly catholic book, expressive of distinctively Anglican ideas in terms of worship. He will concede that the eucharistic rite of 1662 is, in many matters of detail, unsatisfactory and in need of revision. Indeed its revision was the chief concern of his book.² But he does not regard the 1662 rite (and that is to say the 1552 rite also) as being in any way a 'new' rite. It is simply the old Western rite dislocated and rearranged.³ It now possesses, in addition, valuable English characteristics which must not be lost.⁴ The damage must be repaired slowly and conservatively, using 1662 as the basis for all revision and beginning with a restoration of those parts of the rite which were dislocated in 1552.⁵ This is the real substance of Frere's proposals, and obviously it would accord well with the approach of South African bishops.

No doubt the bishops would have agreed with the reasons Frere advanced for desiring revision.⁶ Like Frere, they would have desired the cautious advance, for they had to consider the relations between the church in this country on the one hand, and on the other the Church in England,

1. Frere - Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, p.10 cf. pp.107

2. ibid. pp.192ff.

3. ibid. pp.186ff.

4. ibid. p.13.

5. ibid. pp.188ff.

6. ibid. pp.1ff.

the schismatics, and those in South Africa who felt that the link with England must not be further weakened. These were, of course, cogent reasons for hesitancy and it is not surprising to find the bishops following the kind of approach Frere had pleaded for, an approach which minimised the revolutionary aspect of revision by representing the new book as no more than a rearrangement of the Book of 1662.¹ Frere had suggested that his proposed revisions need not, at first, be printed in a new or alternative Prayer Book, but might simply be added as a codicil, a list of permitted modifications.² Later, commenting on similar liturgical reconstruction elsewhere, Frere wrote;

The progress in Scotland has gone a good deal further than [in England]. In the appendix of the 'Code of Canons' published last year the twenty-ninth section contains 'Permissible additions to and deviations from the Service books of this Church'. The policy, that is to say, has already been adopted which many have advocated for the present stage in England, namely that changes should not be made in the text of the book, but authority should be given in certain respects to vary from the book by addition or alteration on clearly indicated lines.³

This kind of revision by codicil would, of course, have had the effect of further minimising the shock, and the bishops' schedule of 1911 was, in effect, just such a codicil.⁴

The schedule does not, however, venture even as far as the very modest proposals made by Frere. According to the minutes of Episcopal Synod the Liturgical Committee made certain recommendations in 1911 which were not included in the Schedule. It is not clear from the minutes what these further suggestions were. They may have affected the eucharistic rite; but since the report of the Committee is no longer extant it is impossible to tell. In adopting the provisions of the schedule of 1911 the bishops also resolved that these should not be regarded as fully and finally authoritative until they had been approved by Provincial Synod

1. Frere - Some Principles of Liturgical Reform pp.186-190

2. ibid p.195

3. Church Quarterly Review - October 1912 - p.148

4. In November 1912 the Liturgical Committee, in a report to Episcopal Synod, recommended that the bishops of the Province should give some consideration to the list of 'Permissible additions to and deviations from-' the Scottish Prayer Book.

and until the archbishop had consulted with legal advisors on the powers of Episcopal Synod to make alterations to the Book of Common Prayer. The history of the Church of the Province had given cause for an almost majestic conservatism, and an unwholesome dread of the Law. The resultant schedule was a very small step forward which did little more than collect and codify things which the bishops had already allowed and things which were, no doubt, already if illegally, being done. It is within the recollection of certain older priests of the Province, for instance, that as early as 1880 both the prayers after the communion were being used together at the same service. The schedule was only a first step; but a first step implies that others are to follow. It is not easy to determine precisely how far the schedule of 1911 was intended to be a final, and how far a temporary measure. The indications favour the supposition of a temporary measure. The bishops had already by this time appointed a committee of themselves to control all 'Prayer Book Revision and Adaptation'. This committee, variously styled 'for Prayer Book Adaptation and Enrichment', 'Prayer Book Revision', etc., but generally known as the 'Liturgical Committee', was apparently first appointed by Synod on 21 November 1908 and reappointed annually thereafter. But even before that, as early as the first session of Provincial Synod in 1870, it had been resolved that:

The bishops be requested to appoint a commission who shall prepare such services as may be further required, especially a Harvest Thanksgiving Service, which services, when they shall have obtained the unanimous approval of the Bishops of the Province, shall be enjoined for use provisionally by the authority of their Lordships.¹

It must have been envisaged by the bishops when they eventually appointed this committee that it would have some sort of permanence. The establishment of a regular machinery for

1. Constitution & Canons (1870), p.45.

revision implies this, even if, at first, nothing more was planned than a Harvest Festival service. In fact not long after the bishops issued their schedule of 1911 the committee prepared some revised Occasional Offices, the first really new services to be framed in South Africa.¹

In 1911, then, the position was that, although the bishops had left the door open for possible further revision, and although they had adopted some of the proposals contained in Frere's book, they had done nothing to suggest that they were planning a revision of the central part of the Liturgy or that they were considering the adoption of even Frere's modest scheme for 'reconstituting' the English canon. Yet it was just this part of the liturgy, and of the Prayer Book as a whole, which most dissatisfied those who sought for revision at all. Even in our own day, most of the interpolating which is done by those who find the 1662 Eucharistic rite not quite to their taste is done in those parts of the service which surround the consecration prayer.² Almost every proposal for a revision of the 1662 rite, official or unofficial, South African or otherwise, have contained suggestions for making considerable changes in that prayer.³

In 1913 a move was made to secure the revision of this part of the 1662 rite. It was an unofficial proposal emanating from two junior priests in the Diocese of Grahamstown. In 1911, the same year that the bishops issued their first tentative schedule of modifications, the Reverend Charles Gould was appointed assistant curate at the cathedral in Grahamstown. The relevant entry in Crockford for

1. Published in 1914, and consisting of new burial services for 1)catechumens 2)infants 3)persons 'in whose case the Prayer Book Service is not to be used; and also of forms for the admission of catechumens; and of the admission to office of catechists and readers.

2. Cf. e.g. The Priest's Prayer Book (J.Masters & Co. 5th.Ed. 1876)pp.14ff. and The English Missal for the Laity (Knott & Son 1932 - reprint 1949) pp.314ff.

3. See e.g. Liturgy and Worship (Ed. Lowther Clarke) pp344ff.

1948 (shortly before Gould died) tells us that he had been an undergraduate at Fitzwilliam House, Cambridge, and was ordained deacon in 1909 and priest the year after, in the Diocese of Bristol. What it does not tell us is that he had been a Congregational minister before his ordination in the Anglican Church, and that he was, even then, keenly interested in liturgical matters. The fact that Gould was a liturgist before he became an Anglican means that he was likely to have a fresher approach to liturgical revision than most Anglicans, and was less likely to be tied to the Book of Common Prayer by sentiment and tradition. He had been assistant curate at St Mary, Redcliffe, Bristol before coming to Grahamstown, and was subsequently to be Rector of Cathcart, of St. Paul, Fort Elizabeth, rural dean of Cathcart, and eventually a canon of Grahamstown cathedral. He joined the army as a chaplain during the first world war returning to the diocese on demobilisation. He later moved to the diocese of Bloemfontein and was there Rector of Kroonstad and a canon of the cathedral. Gould appears to have been a diligent student and a careful reader of books, for there were amongst his papers after he died several letters written to authors of liturgical studies, pointing out errors they had made. His articles and letters, some of which will be quoted below, make it apparent that he had a caustic wit which made him a formidable opponent. Gould was more than a mere dabbler in liturgiology. His knowledge was extensive, though he never wrote any major work for publication. There is a letter in existence, however, which suggests that as early as July 17th 1911 (when the letter is dated) he was not only taken seriously by those able to distinguish between sound scholarship and mere dabbling, but was also planning to

write something for the Alcuin Club. Unfortunately it is not possible to say what communication from Gould provoked this reply, and there is now no trace of this proposed work or its title. The letter was written just before Gould came out to South Africa. It runs as follows:

"Dear Mr Gould,

This is excellent. In spite of the bankrupt condition of the Club, they must pay your fare! So go ahead.

Yes I think the size of the 'First English Ordo'. X is Lacey. This is a secret."

The letter is signed only with two huge scrawled initials - 'P.D.', but is written on official Alcuin Club paper and dated from St Mary's Vicarage Primrose Hill; the author clearly was Dr. Percy Dearmer. Two other letters from Dearmer to Gould are now in the library of St Paul's College in Grahamstown, and one of them presupposes considerable previous correspondence.¹

Two years after Gould's arrival in Grahamstown, another young priest, Jasper Bazeley, came to be subwarden of St Paul's Hostel (now St Paul's College) in the same city. Bazeley appears to have been of a very different character, shy, retiring, but charming and persuasive, and something of a mystic. The College records give us the following information about his official career. He had been at Pembroke, Oxford, and at Wells Theological College. An M.A. of Oxford and a B.D. of London, he was priested in the Diocese of Norwich in 1908 and, after being assistant curate at St Margaret, King's Lynn, was Vice-Principal of Sarum Theological College. From there he came to be subwarden of St Paul's in 1913 and so remained till ~~when~~ he became Warden. In 1925 ill health, an infection of the bones of one leg, forced him to return to England. He subsequently became chaplain, first to Queen

1. Infra p.214

Margaret's School, Scarborough, and then to the Community of St Denys, Warminster. He was Rector of Bishopstow, Warminster from 1930 until his death in 1934. Bazeley, too, was a student of liturgiology. He had before coming to South Africa written a lengthy essay entitled The Simplicity of Divine Service in the Church of England compared with the example of the Church during the First Five Centuries. The manuscript of this essay is preserved in St Paul's College library. Mrs Bazeley recollects that her husband had 'won an important prize' with this essay just before he left England in 1913, the year in which he took his B.D. at London, but the records of that University contain nothing which helps to explain either the origins of the essay or the nature of the prize. There are, however, two letters from Gould to Mrs Bazeley, written after Bazeley's death, which suggest a possible solution. Gould wrote on 23 July 1940 asking for biographical material to be included in a short history of the South African revision which he was then proposing to write. In the course of the letter he asks for "-- the precise name and date of the liturgical prize which he won at Pembroke (that financed the printing of the 'Revision of the Anaphora')--". In a further letter to Mrs Bazeley, dated 23 September 1942, he said, "One detail I need is whether the Ep. Jeune prize was awarded by Pembroke or by the University". Whatever the origins of the essay may have been, it is clear that in it Bazeley had already begun to develop some of the ideas which later went to make up the argument of the pamphlet he later wrote with Gould, entitled Proposals for the Revision of the Anaphora.¹

1. Hereafter to be cited simply as Proposals. This is the work to which Gould refers, in his letter quoted above, by the second part of its full title. The pamphlet was published by the authors and printed by Slater & Co. of Grahamstown in 1913.

In his early prize essay, The Simplicity of Divine Service etc., which consists of about fifty pages of typescript, Bazeley argued that one ought not to assume;

- (1) that the primitive services were simple, unless one agrees to mean by that term any form which is assumed spontaneously and at an early stage of development;
- (2) that the early forms of service represented fully the ideals of the leaders and saints of the time; or
- (3) that what seemed best for them is necessarily best for us.

The essay consists, first of all, of a comparison of the Liturgy of S. James and other primitive rites with that of 1662; and, secondly, of an examination of the origins of the 1662 Choir Offices. In the essay Bazeley used for his type of the primitive liturgy a conflation and compression, contrived by himself, of the liturgies of S. James (in both the Greek and the Syriac versions), S. Basil, S. Mark, and S. John Chrysostom, and also (as secondary sources) the Apostolic Constitutions, the Book of Serapion, the Catechetical Lectures of St Cyril, the writings of St John Chrysostom and De Sacramentis. His conclusions are not at all what the title of the essay seems at first sight to suggest, for he tends to regard the 'simplicity' of 1662 as an unnecessary impoverishment of the rite. Bazeley, then, had no more reason than Gould to be particularly sympathetic or tender towards the form of the liturgy found in 1662 and hitherto preserved inviolate by the bishops of the Province. Bazeley found the simplicity of the Prayer Book a fault; Gould had become a liturgiologist before he was an Anglican. But both were agreed that an extensive revision of the Book was desirable. Both were, quite evidently, acquainted with a good deal of liturgical scholarship and were at least adequately equipped to frame a proposed form of revision to serve as a basis of discussion.

This they proceeded to do. Since Gould left the Cathedral in Grahamstown in 1914 and Bazeley had only arrived

at St Paul's in 1913, they were not together for any great length of time; but within a few months of Bazeley's arrival they began work upon an interesting liturgical experiment later embodied in pamphlet form in the Proposals. Their chief desire was to substitute for the consecration prayer of 1662 an anaphora composed upon more primitive and catholic lines. They read a paper to a group of clergymen in Grahamstown, giving the reasons for the changes they proposed, and the paper, enthusiastically received by those who heard it read, was privately printed in 1913. Only a few copies of it now exist, though there are several in St Paul's College library. The original group of clergymen consisted of the dean and the chancellor of the cathedral and one of the canons. The chancellor was the Revd. E.C. West, Bazeley's warden at St Paul's. The other member of the 'Grahamstown group' was the Revd. F.R. Phelps, at that time chaplain to the Community of the Resurrection in Grahamstown, and later first dean and then bishop of Grahamstown, and eventually archbishop of Cape Town.¹ The group sent a copy of the paper and of the proposed anaphora² to the bishop, Dr Cornish, the then chairman of the committee on Prayer Book Revision and Adaptation, (Liturgical Committee), requesting him to forward the proposals to his committee and to allow copies to be sent to all the clergy of the diocese. This the bishop agreed to do, though no direct mention of Proposals in the records of either the Episcopal Synod or of the Liturgical Committee can now be found. Bishop Cornish himself went on to advise that copies of the paper 'should be sent to those in England engaged in the same work.'³ The bishop agreed to allow copies to be sent to the clergy of the diocese, and indeed it appears that after the pamphlet

1. See infra. pp. 78 f.

2. The text of the anaphora is given in Appendix 1, infra. The account of the origins of the pamphlet is reconstructed from the preface to Proposals and certain letters printed with it. (Proposals, pp. iii-v.)

3. Ibid., p.v.

had been printed, it was circulated not only in the diocese of Grahamstown but in the Province at large¹ and amongst sympathisers in England. In the pamphlet there appeared;- a short preface, the correspondence which had passed between bishop Cornish and the 'Grahamstown group', the original paper, chiefly Bazeley's work, the proposed anaphora, the joint work of Bazeley and Gould, and three appendices contributed by Gould after the paper had been read to the group. Gould's appendices were chiefly concerned with the invocation used in the proposed anaphora.

The anaphora, revolutionary and unofficial, was the main concern of Proposals. The authors did not make any suggestions as to the rest of the rite though they did propose a re-arrangement of the order of certain prayers. The pamphlet was simply what it claimed to be, a proposal for a radical reconstruction of the consecration prayer. It used the 1662 prayer for one part of the new anaphora, but for the rest it drew upon quite other sources. Such a scheme struck right at the heart of the official plan for revision adopted by the bishops of the Province, and it called for something which could not be disguised as a merely permissive and unimportant alternative to the Book of Common Prayer. Nor was it a reorganisation of liturgical factors gleaned from English Prayer Books, such as Frere had advocated.² Proposals was an attempt to displace the central and most sacrosanct part of 1662 by a new anaphora, constructed on a quite new pattern, and it would have made of 1662 an unmistakably new and different rite.³

Other young clergymen have dreamed of revolutionary measures and nothing much has come of them, but Bazeley and

1. Historical Records, p.227

2. Frere - Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, pp.190 ff.

3. The argument and suggestions of the pamphlet are discussed in detail in Chapter Two, infra.

Could had secured the interest of the senior dignitaries of the diocese. We do not know what the bishops' reaction was when Proposals was brought to their notice, but the reaction of others in the country is recorded. The magazine of the diocese of Pretoria contained in February 1914 the following report:

In 1913¹ the bishops of the Province issued a list of suggestions and adaptations of the services, which was welcomed, because as revision was in the air, it seemed good and right to make provisional experiments before the work of revision was done; partly because a living church must grow, and have elasticity to adapt itself to the varying needs of every age.

After this surely exaggerated description of the bishops' work, the article continued:

A small pamphlet written by Mr Bazeley and Mr Gould goes beyond any suggestions that were made by the bishops for it suggests the complete revision of the anaphora.

There follows a fair and reasonable summary of the main points of Proposals, and the article ends:

But most people would very much like to see the Liturgy rearranged with some additions and improvements, while all are conservative enough to want to keep the old words and phrases they have been used to, and that generations of their forefathers have used. So a revised Liturgy is certain not to please everyone, and until parishes are used to it, it is probable that it will please no one, in spite of the general wish for improvement.²

This article probably did not entirely reflect the official policy of the bishops, but it does represent the sort of attitude of mind for which the bishops had been catering. Official policy thus far had been to use 1662 as the norm and basis for the liturgy, and gradually by means of a schedule of permissible deviations, rather than by framing an alternative rite, to shape it into something more nearly approaching what was then desired. The great disadvantage of this method, in that it had the effect of creating not

1. This must be an error for 1911. A schedule agreed on by Episcopal Synod in 1911 would probably not have been published and issued until 1912.

2. Historical Records, pp. 227 f. The article is not reprinted in Historical Records exactly as it first appeared in The Kingdom (Magazine of the diocese of Pretoria - Vol. XI, No. 2, p. 7. - February 1914). It has been adapted and shortened and no acknowledgement is made of the fact that this has been done. Its substance, however, remains unchanged.

two alternative rites but as many different rites as there were possible combinations of the schedule and the original rite, seems to have escaped notice. The schedule was, however, only a temporary expedient. The chaos, which might have resulted if this policy had been pursued, mercifully never had to be faced.

By retaining 1662 as the basic and only official rite the bishops might hope to pacify those who preferred, for whatever reason, the Book of Common Prayer as it stood. They had taken as their guide one intimately connected with revision in England and they might have argued that they were doing no more than was being done in England, for in England at the time the situation was very similar. In 1914 the Lower House of Convocation had voted for a permissible rearrangement of the 1662 liturgy, somewhat along the lines advocated by Frere. The Upper House had, however, vetoed the proposal.¹

Revision in South Africa had begun with the practical necessity for revising certain parts of the Prayer Book to fit them for use in a colonial Church. There were all sorts of reasons why it might never have progressed beyond that point, and, indeed, for a long time it did in fact halt there. A considerable period of time elapsed, during which men were thinking of revision, before the liturgy was altered at all, and even then the anaphora was not affected by the changes. The historical reasons for the delay, as set out above, have to be appreciated if one is to make a fair estimate of the process and unless it is realised how slow and painful the first grudging steps in revision were, one is liable to form a totally false impression of the final

1. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, pp.56.ff.

South African anaphora.

Bazeley and Gould had made their suggestions in 1913. The bishops did not allow themselves to be much affected by the Proposals, whatever their opinion of the merits and demerits of the work may have been. Episcopal Synod did, however, issue a new schedule of permitted modifications in 1915,¹ but these did not in any way affect the liturgy. For the most part the schedule of 1915 was simply the schedule of 1911 reissued, but now also authorised by Provincial Synod.² The schedule of 1911 had carried a note to the effect that the adaptations were;

put forth by the Bishop of the Diocese for the use of the clergy and laity. They will, if it be found desirable, be submitted to the next Provincial Synod. In the meantime they are put forth provisionally, in view of the advice of the last Lambeth Conference, with a view to ascertaining whether they meet certain expressed needs.

The 1915 schedule was the result of this experiment.³ Its provisions, where they affected the eucharistic rite, marked no change from 1911.⁴ The bishops seem to have assumed that each parish would have at least one celebration of the Eucharist each Sunday. The Provincial Synod had resolved in 1870 that it was desirable that the Holy Communion should be celebrated every Sunday and Feast Day at an early hour.⁵ It is impossible to tell how soon this became an almost universal custom, but it is highly probable that it had happened by the beginning of this century. Even after the 1915 schedule had been published this early celebration would have had to have been the service of 1662 in its entirety, except for the omission of the Longer Exhortation and the use of both the 1662 post-communion prayers. If a second service came later in the day, as was very probable

1. Prayers upon Several Occasions and Modifications of Services, (Church of the Province of South Africa - 1915). The provisions of the schedule are also to be found in Constitution & Canons, (1939) pp.160ff.

2. Supra, pp. 18-24

3. Suggestions and Adaptations etc., (1911), p.2.

4. Prayers upon Several Occasions etc., (1915), p.3.

5. Constitution & Canons, (1870) p.46.

under South African conditions particularly in the country districts where each parish included several villages and hamlets, it might vary somewhat from the norm.¹ The rite might pick up from the Kyries at the end of the litany and proceed from there (after the Prayer of St Chrysostom) to the Collect, Epistle and Gospel. After that the service would again be 1662 in its entirety. Thus, after fifty-five years of hesitant revision, the anaphora itself remained that of 1662, unaltered and unadorned.

1. Of course there would be nothing to prevent the celebrant from using this variation at the earlier service and 1662 at a later one if he so wished.

Chapter Two

Proposals for the Revision of the Anaphora called for a thorough-going reversal of the previous and official policy. Gould asserted many years later in a chapter contributed to Historical Records¹ that he and Bazeley had been much influenced by the work of W.C. Bishop. The chief medium for this influence seems to have been an article which Bishop had published in the Church Quarterly Review for July 1908.² This article is entitled The Primitive Form of Consecration and is several times either quoted or referred to in the Proposals. Another article of Bishop's, The Mass in Spain from the Church Quarterly Review for January 1907 was also used by Bazeley and Gould.³ According to a biographical note introducing a volume of essays and articles written by Bishop and published after his death by the Alcuin Club under the title The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites, all of his writing took the form of articles contributed to the Church Quarterly Review, and they are, therefore, apart from the few reprinted in that collection, now no longer easily accessible.⁴ But W.C. Bishop was an able liturgiologist of considerable reputation. He is, for instance, the only Anglican scholar whose theories Dr Adrian Fortescue thought it worth taking into consideration in his book on the Roman mass.⁵ The fairly long and detailed summary of Bishop's hypothesis which Fortescue gives is based upon the very article of which Bazeley and Gould made so much use, and is now probably the source of most people's knowledge of Bishop's views. Fortescue, however, uses only such parts of the article as bear directly upon the Roman rite. Some of Bishop's arguments are to be found repeated in part in The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites. But even these sources do not by any means cover the whole argument put forward by

1. pp.288ff. N.B.p292

2. Church Quarterly Review, Vol.LXVI. pp.285ff.

3. Reprinted in The Mozarabic & Ambrosian Rites, pp.18ff.

4. Ibid p.V

5. Fortescue - The Mass (2nd Ed.) pp.146ff.

Bishop and, in view of the importance of Bishop's influence upon the Proposals, it is desirable to have the substance of his hypothesis clearly summarised.

The purpose of The Primitive Form of Consecration¹ is a reconstruction of the earliest type of anaphora used by the Church. Bishop is concerned more with the 'form' or pattern of the anaphora than with the theology of consecration; so he pleads that the historical problem, the reconstruction of the form or pattern, should be approached without any doctrinal presuppositions.² His introductory remarks are designed to show that the supposed difference in this respect between East and West has been exaggerated. The general conclusions to which he comes are these:³

- (1) at an early date all liturgies followed the present Eastern pattern of Institution, Anamnesis, and Invocation; and that the West at a later date departed from that pattern.
- (2) that at the very least one cannot be certain that the Roman canon has not been altered from some such supposed original.
- (3) that there is no reason to doubt the primitive order of the parts of the Eastern anaphora, and none for depending on the Roman.
- (4) that Supplices te cannot (because of its elaborate language) be considered an earlier form of the Invocation than its Eastern counterpart; nor can one suppose that in the primitive rites the Invocation ever preceded the words of Institution.

Although the Deir Balizeh fragments had been discovered by the time that Bishop wrote this article (1908), their contents do not seem to have become widely known at that date.

The fragments do not seem to have been edited and published until 1909.⁴

The historical enquiry by which Bishop arrived at these conclusions is a lengthy one, covering each of the main families of liturgies in turn, indicating how each of them

1. Church Quarterly Review Vol.LXVI pp385ff.

2. ibid p.386

3. For these conclusions see Bishop ibid, pp403f. The emphasis on certain phrases in the conclusions is mine.

4. Cf. Salaville - Eastern Liturgies, p.20. & Srawley - The Early History of the Liturgy, p5fn.

is constructed upon a pattern which is generally constant.¹ The enquiry begins with an examination of the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper. Bishop's approach is simpler than the elaborate analyses with which we have recently become familiar.² He points out that our Lord is said to have done three things with the bread (blessing, breaking and distributing) and two with the cup (blessing and distributing).³ The words of Institution are, in fact, words of Administration and consecration is effected by means of an (unrecorded) blessing. Bishop further argues that 'blessing', to the Jews, was a blessing of God in the presence of that which is to be blessed.⁴ It is true that eulogein and eucharistein in the New Testament are often used with God himself or some other person as their object. In the passages referring to the Last Supper⁵ the object of the verbs of thanksgiving and blessing is not directly expressed. But these verbs always appear as participles in these passages, while the other verbs which manifestly have arton as their object are in the indicative. This fact may mean that some difference was intended in the respective relationships of the verbs to that noun. This is true^{also} in the accounts of the feeding of the multitudes.⁶

Tracing the pattern of this blessing or thanksgiving in early Christian liturgies constitutes the main part of the article. In general Bishop distinguishes in the early anaphoras a pattern consisting of an invitation (sursum corda) followed by a series of thanksgivings - for creation, incarnation, passion, resurrection, ascension and

1. Bishop op.cit., pp.387ff.

2. For various views cf. Higgins - Important and Influential Foreign Books - Lietzmann's "Mass and Lord's Supper in the Expository Times (August 1954) Vol.LXV.No.11.p.335. Cf. also Jeremias - The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, passim.

3. Bishop in C.O.R. Vol.LXVI p.387.

4. Cf. Cirlot - The Early Eucharist p.14. Cf. also Gavin - The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments (Lecture III) N.B. p.69. and Cesterley - The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy pp.133ff.

5. Mt.xxvi.26f.; Mk.xiv.22f.; Lk.xxii.17 & 19; ICor.xi.24.

6. e.g. Mk.viii.6.

pentecost.¹ To illustrate this constant pattern he prints a free adaptation of the anaphora of the Liturgy of S. James, condensed and simplified, from the text as printed in Brightman.² Bishop simplifies the language and ideas so as to remove the more developed theological terminology of the fourth century. His purpose is to reconstruct the primitive form of S. James. Clearly this is one of the weakest points in the article. Later³ Bishop has to attempt to answer the question; "Do you consider that the Eastern type of the Great Thanksgiving is really the earliest form?" He has to admit that the Eastern type looks like an elaboration of a simpler form. He has to admit also that the Eastern epiklesis is couched in theological language of the fourth century, whereas the language of the Roman rite is more compatible with the ideas and theology of the second century. But he argues that, if one disregards language and examines the underlying ideas and the form of the older Eastern anaphoras, there is nothing in them which is incompatible with second century thought. To prove this he refers again to his rendering of S. James. He claims that, by recasting the theological language, he has arrived at the second century shape of that liturgy. "The alteration is not in the general scope or purport of the thanksgiving, but only in its theological terms."⁴

At first sight this seems to be a futile argument, depending upon nothing more than the author's ability to turn S. James, as printed in Brightman, into the shape he thinks that a second century anaphora might have had. In point of fact since Bishop's concern is with the pattern or order of the anaphora, the argument is not quite so valueless

1. C.Q.R. LXVI.p.388.

2. ibid.

3. Bishop in C.Q.R. LXVI.p.402.

4. ibid.p.401 - italicised by Bishop.

as it might appear. What he has, in fact, shown by it is that S. James can be rendered in a simplified form, using language typical of the second century without in any way altering the basic pattern on which the anaphora is constructed. It is the pattern, and the pattern alone which is important.

This fact is made quite clear by Bishop's suggestion that the commemoration of the Law and the Prophets, the Benedictus qui venit, the detailed commemoration of the incarnation, and even the words of Institution may be later additions to the primitive pattern.¹ It is only because the pattern already exists that these features can be inserted into it. The argument about the insertion of the Benedictus makes this very clear.²

To imply, as Bishop does³, that the pattern is easily distinguishable in the Eastern anaphora, but not so easily in the Roman, lays him open to the retort that the presence of a pattern at all is a later refinement, and not a primitive feature. The main body of the argument in his article is designed to preclude the possibility of such a retort being made. Bishop examines each of the great families of rites in turn.⁴ In the Eastern liturgies the epiklesis is his prime concern. He analyses the epiklesis of the West-Syrian rite (type - S. James) into five component phrases:

- (a) a prayer to the Father to send the Holy Spirit
- (b) upon us
- (c) and upon the gifts
- (d) that He may make them the Body and Blood

1. Bishop in C. Q. R., Vol. LXVI. pp. 401f.

2. ibid

3. ibid pp. 403f.

4. ibid pp. 387-402.

(e) that it may be to those receiving for the sanctification of body and soul.¹

The Byzantine rite (type - S.Basil) adds a further clause,

(f) changing them by the Holy Spirit.²

Other Eastern rites (East-Syrian p.390 - Egyptian p.391.) he finds to have similar but slightly varying forms of this pattern. Serapion's anaphora is, of course, recognised as an exception since the invocation is of the Word.

Bishop somewhat reluctantly advances a brief rationale of the Eastern form of the consecration.³ The words of Institution, he says, are not regarded as consecratory but are the authority cited for the performance of the rite; and so lead quite naturally to the 'Therefore' of the anamnesis. The logical order is; authority leading to the anamnesis, obedience to the command and designation of the elements to be used for that purpose, and so to the invoking of the Holy Spirit to change the elements according to God's promise. So consecration is clearly seen to be effected by God in answer to the prayers of the Church.⁴

Next W.C.Bishop turns to the Western rites. He confidently asserts that the earliest Western (i.e. Gallican or non-Roman) forms of the consecration prayer are very close in pattern to the Eastern type.⁵ They, too, have institution, anamnesis and invocation, in this order, within the framework of a great prayer of thanksgiving. Bishop's conclusion drawn from the enormous variety of invocations in the Gallican

1. Bishop in C.Q.R., Vol. LXVI. p. 390.

2. Ibid., and cf. K.N. Daniel - A Critical Study of Primitive Liturgies, (A badly produced and rather biased book), where it is argued (pp. 195ff.) that the original invocation in the East was for the illapse of the Spirit 'upon us'. Daniel also maintains (pp. 149ff.) that the primitive consecration formula was a prayer of thanksgiving and that it is still so in parts of the East. The invocation in S. Mark, S. James, and Addai and Mari he regards as interpolation. Cf. also Harden - The Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy, p. 26, for an invocation upon the worshippers.

3. Bishop - op.cit., pp. 392ff.

4. Ibid., p. 393.

5. Ibid.

and related rites is that some of them have become ambiguous because the original type was whittled down and finally discarded under later dogmatic influences.¹ This view is not above question. Srawley takes an opposing one in The Early History of the Liturgy. 'The character of this evidence [i.e. the evidence collected and reviewed by Srawley] suggests that the Invocation was not a native or original feature in the West.'² But the evidence to which Srawley refers chiefly concerns Rome, Milan, and Africa, and hardly at all the Gallican and other non-Roman Western rites. Bishop had argued, earlier, in his article³ on the non-Roman Western masses, that the words 'legitima eucharistia et verus sanguis' found in one source were evidence of a strong and fully developed form of invocation imperfectly obliterated by a later copyist. The original type of Western invocation, he maintained, was very similar to the Eastern.

There remained the Roman canon. This is regarded by Bishop as being a narrowly local rite, originally invariable like the Eastern rites, but varying later in certain parts as a concession to the Western tradition. He notes a parallel between the Eastern anaphoras and the Roman canon; but a parallel which has been broken by the intrusion of later material. Referring to the work of Roman liturgiologists who had argued a similar point,⁴ Bishop maintains that a considerable interpolation from the diptychs has been intruded between the Sanctus and the institution, and that Memento etiam and Nobis quocumque are also later additions to the original prayer. Supposing that there were a link like the Vere sanctus before the institution narrative, that

1. Bishop in C.Q.R., Vol. LXVI, p. 395.

2. Srawley - op.cit., (2nd. Ed.), p. 199.

3. See C.Q.R. for Jan. 1907 - the article was reprinted in The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites, pp. 50ff.

4. Dom Cagin in Paleographie Musicale, (tom. v. - Introduction) and the Abbot Cabrol in Origines Liturgique (appendix I.).

would give, with the rest of the Canon after the removal of the interpolations, a meagre but satisfactory Thanksgiving of a type parallel to the Eastern and Gallican. The canon would then run; Institution - Anamnesis (Unde et memores) - Invocation (of a sort in Supplices te) - brief but sufficient. Duchesne had recognised that Supplices te represented an invocation¹ but Bishop would go further and maintain that this is not in fact that original invocation but a later substitute, using high-flown but ambiguous language.² Almost the most interesting part of Bishop's argument is his attempt to reconstruct the supposed original Roman invocation from the Consecratio fontis in the Gregorian and Gelasian sacramentaries.³ If, as Bishop contends, the form and order of this Consecratio fontis is based upon that of the contemporary Roman Eucharistic prayer, then plainly there is a close parallel between the Eastern and the Roman rites. But, and here there is need for caution, if doubt is thrown upon the purity of the Roman form of the Gregorian and Gelasian sacramentaries, much of Bishop's argument must lose its force and attractiveness. Dix has argued that the Gelasian Sacramentary "is in substance the Roman rite of the 6th century" and that the Gregorian draws upon "older 'unofficially supplemented' books already (c.790) in circulation in Gaul."⁴ Duchesne says of the Gelasian Sacramentary; "It is, both as regards its origin and text as a whole, a Roman Book but one which has undergone many modifications in a Gallican direction."⁵ Once, of course, that it is admitted that

1. Duchesne - Christian Worship, (2nd Eng. Ed.) p.181f. and cf. the outline of the primitive Latin Liturgy given by Cabrol in The Mass of the Western Rite (Eng. Tr.) pp.168 for comparison with Bishop's reconstruction.

2. Bishop in C.O.R. Vol.LXVI p.399.

3. ibid pp.399f.

4. The Shape of the Liturgy (2nd Ed.) pp.363ff.

5. Duchesne - Christian Worship (2nd Eng. Ed.) p.134 and cf.

E. Bishop Liturgica Historia pp.62ff. N.B. pp.75f.

these sacramentaries are partly Gallican in origin, then it is possible that the Consecratio fontis which they contain may be based upon the pattern of the Gallican anaphoras and not upon any supposed primitive Roman rite.

Bishop's article¹ is really a claim that the primitive consecration prayer was a general thanksgiving for all God's saving mercies to man, arranged in a logical (that is to say, historical) order. To this thanksgiving, he argues, there was added at the most suitable points those three things which specifically relate it to the Last Supper - the narrative of the institution, the offering to God of the elements of the rite, and the invocation which sums up the purpose of the whole prayer.² This provides, as it were, a secondary logical order superimposed upon the thanksgivings. This double order is, in Bishop's view, the primitive pattern of the anaphora.

The earliest definite traditional pattern we possess is that of the Eastern liturgies, and this form probably represents, with only unimportant changes in the wording not in the meaning, the oecumenical tradition of the early ages.³

Such a reconstruction of the primitive pattern would probably be at least partly accepted by a good many modern scholars. Dix has put forward the tentative suggestion that the 'thanksgivings' may well prove to be the most primitive part of the anaphora, and the basis of such uniformity as there was in the practice of the primitive Church.⁴ Ciriot agrees generally with Bishop's supposition that the words of institution, the oblation and the invocation have been fitted into the pattern of thanksgivings.⁵ Lietzmann's hypothesis that there were two quite distinct original forms of the Eucharist would,

1. See C.Q.R., Vol. LXXX, p. 382ff. for a further treatment of the subject by Bishop, but subsequently to the publication of Proposals.

2. Bishop in C.Q.R., Vol. LXVI, pp. 392ff.

3. Ibid., p. 404

4. The Shape of the Liturgy, (2nd. Ed.) pp. 217ff.

5. The Early Eucharist, p. 51, cf. pp. 69f. and pp. 61ff. - this contains a discussion of the meaning of 'blessing', cf. Oesterley - The Jewish Background etc. pp. 188ff.

if proved, destroy the force of Bishop's appeal to the universal character of his pattern. But Lietzmann's theory confronts one with a considerable problem in that the documentary sources upon which he has based his argument are all subject to a wide variety of interpretation. No one, for instance, has yet been able to fix exactly either the date or the place of origin of the Didaché. 'This composite manual has been a great puzzle to inquirers ever since its reappearance in 1883.'¹ Even those who champion the authoritative conservatism of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus admit that 'the history of its author must needs raise serious questions about the contents of his treatise.'² Serapion's rite, again, may have been no more than 'a primitive and local variation of the Alexandrian fluid rite.'³ The eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions is viewed in so many different lights that 'it is difficult to speak about it at all without getting upon debated ground.'⁴ Not one of these documents can safely be called an authoritative liturgy in use at some definite place at some fixed time. Upon these, and upon his interpretation of them, Lietzmann's argument depends. It may be held that there are no more authoritative sources than these. However true this may be, until such time as more cogent proof can be advanced to show that Lietzmann's documents are authoritative enough to bear the weight of argument which he places upon them, his view must be regarded as hypothetical.

Even ex hypothesi Lietzmann is not really destructive of Bishop's theory. If the early Eucharist did not contain the thanksgivings,⁵ then it is extremely difficult to explain how such a peculiarly Jewish feature should have been intro-

1. Frere - The Anaphora, p.12.
 2. Dix - The Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus, Vol.1, p.xxxvii.
 3. Maxwell - Outline of Christian Worship, p.35.
 4. Connolly - The So-Called Egyptian Church Order, p.8.
 5. Lietzmann - Mass and Lord's Supper, (Eng.Tr.), p.136.

duced into the liturgy in a predominantly gentile church. All the rites Lietzmann uses contain a thanksgiving.¹ Even the Egyptian rite is no exception.² In any event the evidence Lietzmann cites as touching this rite is patient of a different interpretation from that which he employs. Serapion's rite may well be regarded as evidence for the fact that in Egypt the sanctus, institution, anamnesis, and invocation were introduced into the Great Thanksgiving at different points from those of the Eastern rites; a supposition which would support Bishop's contention that the thanksgivings are the oldest part of the prayer. Finally Lietzmann admits that the Thanksgiving was typical of his primitive 'Pauline' rite³ - and it is from this rite that, in his view, almost all the later liturgies evolved.⁴ Even - if Lietzmann is right - in the Jerusalem type the blessing of the bread was by thanksgiving.⁵

Positive support for Bishop's hypothesis is to be found in E.G.P. Wyatt's Eucharistic Prayer⁶ a great deal of which is devoted to an attempt to demonstrate that the Roman canon once followed the pattern now found in most Eastern anaphoras, and in particular adduces further evidence to support Bishop's argument from the consecratio fontis. Bishop's reconstruction of this supposedly universal pattern of thanksgivings, the part of his work which most influenced the Proposals of Bazeley and Gould, is our main concern in this chapter.

The argument of the Proposals begins with an

1. ibid. in.re.Hippolytus p.143.; Didache¹ pp.188ff.

2. see ibid. pp.51,61 & N.B. pp.157ff.

3. Lietzmann op.cit. pp.186f.

4. ibid. pp.209ff.

5. ibid. pp.195 - 203 and N.B. p.203 cf. pp.161f. and cf. Cullmann's insistence that both types of eucharist originate in the Last Supper. (Cullmann - Early Christian Worship (Eng.Tr.) p.17.n.)

6. Wyatt, op.cit., pp. 21-23, et passim.

examination of the earliest liturgies. The authors, admitting that we know nothing of the wording of these rites, quote Duchesne's judgement¹ that the only original Christian addition to the pattern of Jewish synagogue worship was the threefold Eucharistic action of 'thanksgiving', 'breaking' and 'distributing'. They note the point made by W.C. Bishop, that the words of institution were originally words of administration.² By using evidence cited in Westcott's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews³ they show that Hebrew blessings were prayers of thanksgiving. The early documentary evidence cited by Bazeley and Gould is in no way remarkable; it consists chiefly of some phrases in I Clement which are echoed in the liturgy of A.C.VIII.⁴, the 'technical' use of the term eucharist in Ignatius⁵, and the usual references to Justin Martyr.⁶ It becomes clear thus early in the pamphlet that the authors' main purpose is to stress the element of thanksgiving in the primitive anaphores. But Bazeley and Gould do not always follow W.C. Bishop as closely as this in detail. They leave aside the bulk of the early evidence of which he made use and turn instead to the third century. They quote the Canons of Hippolytus⁷ for the Sursum Corda and words of administration which echo our Lord's original words 'This is my Body', 'This is my Blood'.⁸ They make use of Cyprian On the Lord's Prayer.²⁰ and Clement's use⁹ of Daniel vii.10. for early evidence of the recitation of the Sanctus. Their purpose here is to show that the Sursum Corda and Sanctus are of early origin.

1. Duchesne - Christian Worship pp.48f.

2. supra.p. 39

3. Westcott, op.cit.pp.206ff.

4. I Clement 59 & 60

5. Ep.ad.Smyrn.8.

6. I Ap.13.65.67.

7. From Duchesne - Christian Worship (3rd Eng.Ed.)(pp.525ff.) p.526.paras.21ff.

8. ibid.p.534. paras.146f.

9. It is not clear from the Proposals but the passage must be I.Clement.34.

Bishop's point of view was rather different.¹

When Bazeley and Gould turn to consider later liturgies their dependence upon Bishop is, again, not marked. They prefer Duchesne's classification of the families of rites to Bishop's² - though they reject with scorn Duchesne's hypothesis that the Alexandrian liturgy was derived from the Roman. At this point and without any further preliminaries, the authors of Proposals seize upon the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions (A.C.VIII) as the ideal type of the primitive liturgy. They hasten to add that they do not believe that this liturgy was ever used. They argue, instead, that the man who compiled A.C.VIII. must have been familiar with a very similar rite. In view of the startling differences between Bazeley and Gould's own compilation³ and the rite with which they were most familiar (1662), we may be allowed to regard this assumption with reserve. It has been claimed that A.C.VIII. was produced by "working up previous liturgical matter in ---- [a] free and irresponsible way".⁴ No doubt much the same thing was said of the authors of Proposals. They do not make it clear why they prefer A.C.VIII. to any other early liturgy, and to Bishop's compressed and simplified S.James.⁵ With the same arbitrariness with which Bishop had not only selected, but actually rewritten his prototypical rite, Bazeley and Gould simply inform the reader that the anaphora of A.C.VIII. is to be regarded as the best model of primitive rites,⁶ and proceed to a long and detailed analysis of the commemorations contained in it.

1. C.Q.R. Vol. LXVI. p. 388.

2. Duchesne op.cit. p. 55. cf. Bishop in C.Q.R. Vol. LXVI. pp. 387f.

3. For the proposed anaphora see Appendix I.

4. Blomfield - The Eucharistic Canon p. 13

5. SUBRA, p. 40

6. The relative dating of A.C.VIII. and connected documents is discussed inter alia B.S. Easton - The An. Trad. of Hippolytus pp. 9ff. and also in Blomfield op.cit. where the contents of the documents are conveniently summarised.

Gould added three appendices to Proposals. In the first of these he argued, on the basis of I Clement.24. and the liturgies of S.James and of St Cyril's lectures, that the Sanctus aspires to link the Eucharist with the worship of heaven. He composed an alternative Preface which brings out this idea very clearly. This may explain why Bazeley and Gould attempted to show that the Sanctus was an early feature of the anaphora and include one in their own proposed prayer, in spite of the fact that they quote Bishop's view that it was not an original and primitive part of the form. Bishop had argued that the Sanctus in A.C.VIII. was of later provenance than the thanksgivings.¹ Bazeley and Gould retain it though, when they come to the Benedictus qui venit, they hold that this is a late feature and omit it altogether from their anaphora.

After the authors of the pamphlet have expressed their preference for A.C.VIII. as the best type to be followed, they proceed to a comparison of this rite with the liturgies of S.James, S.Basil and S.Chrysostom, and note the points at which each of these differs from the norm of A.C.VIII. It is worth noting that the third of Gould's appendices is an abbreviated translation of the common features of the Greek and Syriac versions of S.James. This condensed anaphora is not identical with the version Bishop included in his article discussed above; nor with that 'reconstructed' by Bazeley in The Simplicity of Divine Service etc.² No doubt Gould provided this adaptation of S.James as an additional foundation for the argument of the pamphlet in case A.C.VIII. should not seem as convincingly authoritative to the reader as it was to the authors.

The argument which Proposals presents thus far is

1. Bishop in C.S.R., Vol.LXVI.p.388.

2. Supra p.29

best summed up as an attempt to show that in the early ages the celebrant's train of thought was expected to follow a series of commemorations, giving thanks for God's revelation of himself to man over the whole scheme of history from creation to Pentecost. Normally, the authors hold, supplication is only introduced into this scheme at the memorial of Pentecost where the mention of the Holy Spirit provides a natural link with the invocation. This feature, they would have us believe, is the climax of the anaphora as early as the time of the Council of Nicea. The latter part of the pamphlet is a particular and detailed examination of the nature of the primitive invocation. It adds nothing to the argument and the evidence cited is in no way out of the ordinary. The conclusion to which Bazeley and Gould come is that 'some kind of invocation of the Divine assistance was universal and that there is no hint (except possibly in De Sacramentis, iv, 23.) of a theory that the recitation of the words of Institution alone would suffice.'¹ Unfortunately they immediately went beyond what their evidence² warranted

1. Proposals, p.10.

2. The evidence cited by Bazeley and Gould to establish the nature of the primitive invocation is:

Justin Martyr - I Apology, i. 66.

Irenaeus - Adv. Haer. IV. xviii. 6.

Tertullian - Ad. Marcion, iv. 40

Origen as quoted by Warren in Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church, p. 121

Athanasius as quoted by Stone in Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, Vol. I. p. 70.

Cyril - Catech. Lect., XIX. 7.

Chrysostom as quoted in Brightman - Liturgies Eastern and Western, Vol. I. pp. 474 & 479.

Ambrose - De Myst., 54, & De Fide, iv. 124.

Pseudo-Ambrose - De Sacr., iv. 23.

Optatus - as quoted by Gore in Body of Christ, p. 84.

Gelasius as quoted by Routh in Script. Eccl. Gn., Vol. II. p. 39, & by Fortescue in The Mass, p. 406. n.

See Proposals, pp. 10ff. (footnotes). If the material listed here were as decisive as Bazeley and Gould assumed, the controversy over primitive consecration prayers would have been settled long ago.

and stated categorically that a fully developed Eastern type of invocation was a feature of the primitive anaphora. Such an invocation formed a part of the proposed prayer appended to their pamphlet. Gould, moreover, devoted the third of his appendices to an examination of the invocation of the English rite of 1549. He deals at length with the peculiarity of its position and quotes Fortescue to the effect that such a position 'is unparalleled in Christendom.'¹ Fortescue, of course, is not referring to the 1549 rite in the passage quoted by Gould, but to the ancient rite of Alexandria. This rite is discussed by the same author in The Mass² where reference is made to the Deir Balizeh fragments. Gould has evidently read this passage of The Mass, but he is obviously unfamiliar with the papyri³ which he contrasts with the Egyptian texts printed in Brightman's Liturgies Eastern and Western. He prefers to disregard the evidence, such as it is, of the Deir Balizeh texts. He regards the double invocation, if that is what it was, of the Egyptian rite as being a local variant of a common custom. He quotes Fortescue again to the effect that invocations 'are scattered throughout various liturgies both within and often before the consecration prayer.'⁴ If there is to be one invocation, then, Gould argues, the proper place for it is after the anamnesis. His hypothesis is that Cranmer based the 1549 invocation upon Quam oblationem of the Latin canon; and taking this to be an invocation thought its position a legitimate one. Gould, therefore, rejects the possibility that 1549 might serve as a pattern for reconstructing an Anglican anaphora.

In the text of the pamphlet there is next a critique of some contemporary theories of the origin of the Roman rite:-

-
1. Fortescue in Catholic Encyclopaedia, Vol. III, pp. 264f.
 2. Fortescue - The Mass, p. 403.
 3. Proposals, Appendix III, p. 27.
 4. Fortescue - The Mass, p. 403.

Duchesne's¹, W.C.Bishop's,² Fortescue's,³ and Drews's.⁴ Seizing on the admission of both Duchesne and Fortescue that the Roman rite once almost certainly contained an invocation, Hazeley and Gould attribute its later 'toning down' to doctrinal influence.⁵ They assert that similarities between Eastern and Western anaphoras are too great to be coincidental, and must be due either to a common origin and constant interchange of ideas or to wholesale importation. This dilemma does not exhaust all the possible hypotheses, however, and it is obviously unsatisfactory. Phrases like 'common origin' require careful definition, and it is difficult to see what real distinction there is between 'constant interchange of ideas' and 'wholesale importation'. The former phrase merely has a more pleasant sound. The 'wholesale importation' hypothesis used by Duchesne to account for some of the non-Roman Western rites⁶ is rejected with scorn by the authors of Proposals. Their alternative theory is that the Western anaphoras all originally followed the same pattern as the Eastern and were gradually made to conform to the Roman type. This does not, of course, explain the origin of the Roman pattern. All that the authors say of it is that, so far from being the mother-liturgy of the West, it was thrust upon it 'by pope and Frankish king, or on England by the ultramontanes between Whitby and Cloveshoe.'⁷ There is only one primitive type and the Roman rite is an inferior deviation from it; 'inferior in rationality, method, and catholic authority. It was adopted, partly under pressure, partly in zeal for the Roman and imperial idea, and partly, if not chiefly, because the clergy were too

1. Christian Worship, pp.86 - 95 and NB.Chapter III.

2. In C.O.R., Vol.LXVI, p.393,n.

3. The Mass, pp.138ff. & Cath:Encyc:, Vol.III,pp.264.ff.

4. As summarised in Fortescue - The Mass, pp.156ff.

5. Cf. W.C.Bishop in C.O.R., Vol.LXVI.p.396.

6. Christian Worship, p.93.

7. Proposals, p.13.

ignorant to manage the elaborations of the old Western rites.¹

When Bazeley and Gould come to state the practical application of their hypothesis they appeal for a reversal of this trend by which the Roman canon became the norm for Western Christendom. The alternatives as stated in Proposals are either to leave 1662 unchanged and face the prospect of illegal interpolation or to adopt the Gregorian canon complete with all its faults. The one possibility not envisaged is just that kind of compromise which was reflected in the South African final form. The authors of Proposals claimed to have based their own attempt at reconstructing a non-Roman anaphora on two fundamental principles: to make use of every existing phrase of the 1662 consecration prayer, and to bring these phrases into harmony with the fourth century pattern.

The fourth century is an odd choice for liturgical scholars who claim to be following W.C. Bishop, but it is in keeping with the rest of the pamphlet. Most of the patristic evidence cited is from the third and fourth centuries and Bishop's attempt to reconstruct a second century anaphora is ignored.² Other points of difference between Bishop and the authors of Proposals have already been noted. Bishop himself commented on one of the differences in a letter to Gould dated 20 March 1914.

My Dear Sir,

The pamphlet arrived yesterday, with your letter; and I have read through the pamphlet, but hope to do so more carefully by and by. If it had only come a few days earlier I could have reviewed it for the forthcoming no. of C.Q.R. But it's just too late to be included in an article on three other books of the same kind which I have written for this no.

I applaud your courage in returning to the early liturgies instead of (as many do) looking only to former revisions of the Prayerbook. But I prefer my own restoration of the 4th century³ form of St. James (in an article The Primitive Form

1. Proposals, p.14.

2. Bishop in C.Q.R., Vol. LXVI, pp. 388 & 400ff.

3. Although in this letter Bishop refers to his own '4th century form of St. James' in the original article referred to it is clear that he there thought of it as the second century form of the anaphora. (See passage in C.Q.R. cited in previous footnote.)

of Consecration) anaphora to the one which you give. The bits which I have left out are those which appear to me to have evidently been added about the 5th century - and are characterised by turgidity and an artificial piling up of epithets and clauses from which the earlier form (as I take it) was freer.

Bazeley and Gould deliberately chose the fourth century as their model because:

- (I) it is the first period which has left us a complete liturgy;
- (II) it is the earliest in which the doctrines of the Church were taught in the technical terms which have become universal; and
- (III) it is the latest at which there is any high degree of uniformity in Christendom. ¹

Next the authors assert that an anaphora based on the 4th century pattern could exclude no catholic ceremonial since all ceremonial has been fitted into this pattern in the course of subsequent history, often without the introduction of new ritual. On the other hand the fourth century anaphora does not positively require any ceremonial other than is necessary for the performance of any rite. Finally, the authors justify their use of Greek rather than Latin sources;

- (I) because they are truer to primitive type in their orderly arrangement.
- (II) because so doing reduces the loss in translation, for the Latin in most cases is probably based on a Greek original.

[The example given in Proposals is the ambiguous ut fiat representing the Greek poiein.]

- (III) our information on the Keltic use is only sufficient to assure us that it was of the Gallican type, but it tells us little of the pre-Roman canon. If we act upon this one piece of information and turn to Gaul, we find it almost impossible to distinguish what was normal or early amidst that vast variety.
- (IV) there is much to be said for turning to Jerusalem in prayer. ²

The last of these four grounds for preferring Greek sources comes as a shock to the reader. The metaphor is quaint to the point of obscurity. To Bazeley and Gould 'turning to Jerusalem' meant making use of the ancient liturgy of Jerusalem, but they do not specifically say so. There has been nothing in Proposals to prepare for a turning to Jerusalem even in the metaphorical sense. We have seen how the authors preferred A.C.VIII. to S. James. We have seen how they followed

1. Proposals, p.14

2. Ibid., p.15.

W.C. Bishop in general and yet did not make use of his reconstruction of a second century S. James. Then, without warning, there is this leap from imaginative to serious thinking. Even if, the authors argue, Neale's attempt to prove it¹ must be discounted, the liturgy of S. James may yet be apostolic in origin. For a moment it seems that the authors are going to follow Bishop in his preference for an early form of S. James after all, especially when it is noted that Gould devotes the second of his appendices to a translation of that rite. 'In the main, so the argument of the Proposals runs, 'it [S. James] agrees marvellously with St Cyril's lectures and with the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions. Anyhow it is the nearest we can get to antiquity...' But immediately after this, and there seems to be a non sequitur in the argument, they go on to say, '.. so, having decided to follow the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions in outline, except where it wanders from the logical sequence and from all other liturgies, the compilers have picked their phrases where they could get good authority and a not too un-English idea.'² A.C. VIII. is preferred to S. James after all. Perhaps the explanation of this apparent uncertainty is to be found in the fact that the pamphlet was the work of two men in collaboration. Perhaps Gould preferred S. James, as his second appendix might seem to show, while Bazeley preferred A.C. VIII. But in his essay, The Simplicity of Divine Service, Bazeley had used S. James as his primary source and A.C. VIII. only as secondary to it. In Proposals the position is reversed. Even though it is difficult to explain this muddle, it is very clear that S. James and A.C. VIII. are the two chief sources for the anaphora attached to Proposals. The authors have also made use of phrases from the 1549, 1662 and Scottish³

1. In Essays in Liturgiology, (2nd. Ed.), pp. 411ff.

2. Proposals, p. 15.

3. The term 'Scottish rite' is used to denote the Scottish Communion Office of 1912 of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.

rites. It would seem that Bazeley and Gould had also consulted the non-Jurors' liturgy, for they assert that they have themselves arrived at approximately the same result, though by an independent route. The reference given for the non-Jurors' liturgy is Darwell Stone's Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, Vol. II, pp. 48 Off. The text of the non-Jurors' anaphora of 1718 given by Stone does agree fairly well in content and order with the anaphora of Proposals. In both, for instance, the Amen is retained after the words of institution, giving an immediate appearance of similarity. But the non-Jurors used hardly anything from 1662 and they did not include any variable propers within the consecration prayer itself. The first part of the non-Jurors' anaphora is longer and more diffuse, and the oblation and invocation shorter, than the corresponding parts of Bazeley and Gould's rite.

The authors conveniently printed a list of sources used in compiling their anaphora and this, with a system of marginal references used by them, makes it possible to analyse exactly the prayer into its component parts.¹ The sources used were A.C.VIII., S.Basil, S.Chrysostom, S.Mark, S.James and the Nestorian liturgy from Brightman's Liturgies Eastern and Western, Neale's essay on the Gallican rite in Essays in Liturgiology, the Catechetical Lectures of St Cyril, and the Mozarabic mass used to illustrate W.C.Bishop's article The Mass in Spain (reprinted in The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites.) From this congeries of source material Bazeley and Gould constructed their proposed anaphora. They directed that it was to follow the Comfortable Words in the 1662 rite. After the Sursum corda the anaphora follows the 1662 words as far as the end of the preface when there is a thanksgiving for creation. At Trinity the 1662 proper preface for that feast takes the place of this thanksgiving, as does the Scottish preface for saints

1. Bazeley used a similar system of marginal reference to indicate his sources in his so-called 'typical liturgy' in The Simplicity of Divine Service, which obviously formed the basis of the system later used in Proposals.

on most Red Letter days. A thanksgiving for the angels and the Sanctus follows and then there is a commemoration of the Law and the Prophets, which is invariable, and of the Incarnation which varies at Easter, Epiphany and on feasts of Our Lady. The 1662 consecration prayer serves as a fixed commemoration of the passion and institution. The anamnesis follows, based chiefly upon that of the Scottish rite, and varies at Easter, Ascension, and Whitsun, when it is replaced by the 1662 preface proper to those seasons. The invocation is invariable and is introduced by the words 'Hear us, o merciful Father ..' from 1662. The 1662 prayer of Oblation follows, with very little change, and is followed in turn by the Lord's Prayer and the Prayer of Humble Access. The 1662 words of administration are replaced by an invitation based on the 1552 form of the words and a form of administration which is, in fact, the form of 1549 without 'which was given/shed for thee'. If a second consecration is required the priest is directed to consecrate again in both kinds, using the whole prayer from 'Our Saviour Christ' to 'all other benefits of his passion.' This admirably consistent direction is important in view of the controversy which was later to centre round the question of a second consecration.¹

The framework of the 1662 rite as a whole remained intact. The parts of the service in which the congregation join, and the words introducing these parts, are unchanged. The whole of the 1662 prayers of Consecration and Oblation are incorporated into the new anaphora, and a place is found for each of the proper prefaces. The new material in the prayer makes up about half of its total length. Of this, half again is based upon the language of either A.C.VIII. or S. James. These are, as might be expected, by far the most important

1. Infra. p. 115f.

of the sources. The Scottish rite contributes one of the propers and serves for two or three short passages as well. S. Mark, S. Basil, and S. Chrysostom provide most of the rest and a few phrases are drawn from St. Cyril's lectures, and from the Nestorian liturgy. Two clauses are added direct from the Roman mass, but there is no direct verbal dependence upon any non-Roman Western source.

Some of the additions have, for us, an unfamiliar sound, and some have that lifelessness which one has come to expect from translations of disused liturgies. Examples of this may be found in the post-sanctus - 'For thou indeed art most high and most holy, and we bless thee and we thank thee ..'- and in the proper for Saints' days - '.... for all thy gifts, known to us and unknown, we give thanks unto thee ..'- but most of the work is extremely well done. The English used to translate phrases drawn from ancient liturgies is as far as possible that which is familiar to us in the Authorised Version of the Bible and in liturgical sources like the collects and creeds of the 1662 book. The ferial preface is a good example of this apt use of familiar language. The passage, which will be found printed in appendix 1, infra., is based chiefly on A.C.VIII., according to the authors' marginal references, but the actual wording of it is not at all strange. 'Of whom all fatherhood etc.' is from the A.V. of Ephesians, iii, 15; 'Almighty' and 'Everlasting God' from the 1662 preface; 'Giver of all good things' from the Collect for Trinity VI; 'the same yesterday, today, etc.' from Hebrews, xiii, 8.; and 'all things visible and invisible' from the Nicene creed. In fact there is very little of the language of the proposed anaphora which is unsuitable, or could not easily be made suitable, for use in church.

Bishop Fisher, once chairman of the Liturgical Committee,¹ is of the opinion that the credit for the felicitous

1. He was Hazeley's predecessor as subwarden at St Paul's & subsequently became bishop first of Lebombo and later of Natal.

use of familiar and rhythmical phrases ought to be given to Gould. It is worth comparing the memorial of creation in Proposals with the 'typical liturgy' compiled by Bazeley in The Simplicity of Divine Service. In the latter this thanksgiving runs:

Who didst make man from the earth after thine image and when he transgressed thy commandment and fell thou didst not disregard not leave him, o good God, but didst correct him as a tender father, didst call him by the Law, and didst educate him by the prophets.

The corresponding passage in Proposals reads:

Who having made man after thine image, didst not, when he fell, forsake him, but didst call and teach him by the Law and the Prophets.

In each the marginal references indicate that the passage is modelled on A.C.VIII, and S.James, but the second is shorter, less verbose, and certainly more happily phrased. A good deal of 'Eastern prolixity'¹ has been eliminated. It may well be that the improvement is due to Gould's influence, though it is possible that it is to be explained quite simply by the fact that Bazeley composed his earlier 'typical liturgy' for the academic purpose of comparison with 1662 and was not concerned with matters of literary style. At all events the rite of Proposals does for the most part escape the foreign, stilted style, so noticeable, for instance, in translations of the Roman missal intended for use in Anglican worship. Almost certainly this is owing to the fact that the proposed anaphora was a composition and not a translation. Bazeley and Gould showed themselves competent and imaginative in welding the whole of their anaphora together and particularly in their neat use of the 1662 proper prefaces. Undoubtedly the large number of variable parts from which the celebrant would have had to select that which was appropriate to the day was a factor militating against their anaphora's adoption by the Province.

1. Cf. Salaville - Introduction to Eastern Liturgies, p.47.

Sometimes, indeed, the break comes in mid-sentence and the eye has to travel down as much as half a page to find the next clause. This inconvenience might have been overcome in practice by printing the whole anaphora proper to each feast and season in that part of the missal which contains the other propers, collects, epistles, and gospels.

The anaphora of Proposals is so admirable an attempt to translate competent scholarship into a workable modern rite that one cannot but regret that it never became a part of the South African book. Dr. Frere, however, apparently felt no such regret, for he said of Proposals:

It counselled a following of Greek usages, and the revised Anaphora which it contained drew greatly upon Greek sources and phraseology. The Bishops were better advised in not following this invitation to Greece, but in trying to let the Anglican liturgy develop in Africa along its own lines.¹

With the second part of this dictum one can have no quarrel, nor is this the place to discuss how far the bishops were successful in devising a typically Anglican and African rite. But Frere's classification of the proposed anaphora as being of the Greek type is more open to question. It is admitted that Bazeley and Gould deliberately modelled their anaphora upon A.C.VIII. and S.James, in language, pattern and ideas. It was their specific intention to "turn to Jerusalem", spiritually and figuratively, in their prayers. The invocation of their anaphora is of the Greek type. Yet it would seem that the effect they achieved is not so much Greek as Gallican. They themselves, it is true, specifically disclaimed any intention of following Gallican patterns,² and they make no use of even such incomplete and fragmentary Gallican and Mozarabic sources as are listed amongst their authorities.³ They do admit, however, that the points at which they provided for variations

1. C.C.R., Vol.XC. p.367.(A review of the S.A. alternative form of 1919)

2. Supra. p. 65

3. Neale's Essays in Liturgiology and Bishop's article The Mass in Spain, in C.C.R., Vol.LXIII.

within the anaphora are just those points at which the non-Roman Western rites themselves varied.¹ This does, in effect, lend a Gallican appearance to the anaphora. After all, the basic pattern of both Eastern and Gallican anaphoras is, particularly if W.C.Bishop is right, the same pattern. The principal difference between the two is that the Eastern anaphora is invariable (though the whole rite may vary occasionally), whereas the Western anaphora is composed of many variable propers. As E.G.F.Wyatt has remarked;

..[the] continuity of the Eucharistic Prayer is an important characteristic. It obtains not only in the Eastern liturgies but in the Gallican, in spite of the fact that the Anaphora in the latter is composed almost entirely of prayers that vary from day to day. For these latter, numerous as they are, are constructed so as to fit into the framework of the Anaphora, in such a way as to form one continuous prayer.²

It would seem to follow that if Bazeley and Gould took the Eastern pattern for the framework of their anaphora and made it vary at just those points where the propers of the non-Roman Western rites came, they would have achieved something closely resembling, in pattern at least, the Gallican masses. A tabular comparison makes this clear.

Non-Roman Western³

Sursum corda

Illatio or Contestatio
proper to the season and
leading into -

Sanctus

Post-Sanctus proper to
season - usually ending
with a reference to Our
Lord as a link with -

Prædis, a more or less
fixed narrative of the
institution.

Proposals⁴

Sursum corda

Variable commemoration of
creation, leading into

Sanctus

Variable commemoration ending
with thanksgiving for
Incarnation as a link with

1662 consecration prayer -
invariable - serving as narra-
ative of institution.

1. Proposals, p.16

2. E.G.F.Wyatt - The Eucharistic Prayer, p.17, & cf. pp.18ff.

3. See West - Western Liturgies, pp. 51 & 63.; Bishop - Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites, pp.36ff.; Duchesne - Christian Worship, pp.213ff.; & Norman - Handbook to the Liturgy, pp.240ff.

4. See appendix 1., infra.

Post-Fridie or Post-Secreta; proper but usually containing an anamnesis and an invocation of some kind.

Variable anamnesis leading into an invariable invocation followed by 1662 prayer of Oblation.

There is nothing un-Gallican, then, in the pattern and order of the proposed anaphora, nor is there anything essentially un-Gallican in the form of the invocation, at least if one is prepared to accept Bishop's explanation of the origin of the Gallican type.¹ The part of the proposed anaphora which is least like the corresponding part of the Gallican mass is the commemoration of the Law and the Prophets. The non-Roman Western rites seem usually to have moved directly from the Sanctus to the memorial of the incarnation or passion. This is to be explained by the presence of the Benedictus qui followed by the words 'vere sanctus, vere benedictus etc.'² But there are occasional traces of a memorial of the Law and the Prophets³ and even of creation in some masses.⁴

Gallican or Eastern, however, the proposed anaphora has had but little direct effect upon the final form of the South African rite. In most cases where the language of Proposals is similar to that of the South African form the similarity is due to a common dependence upon either 1662 or the Scottish rite. Where both have borrowed from the Scottish form the present South African rite is nearer the original than it is to Proposals and it is not, therefore, likely that the borrowing from the Scottish rite is a mediate one through Proposals. The only phrase from the whole of the proposed anaphora which has found its way into the final South

1. Bishop in C.O.R., Vol. LXVI, pp. 394ff.

2. Cf. Duchesne - Christian Worship, pp. 214ff. and W.C. Bishop op.cit., p. 402 and in The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites, p. 36.

3. Bishop - Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites, loc. cit.

4. Duchesne - op.cit., p. 214. (Missale Gothicum) and cf. also West - Western Liturgies, pp. 51 & 64.

African rite is the phrase 'to take our nature upon him', used by Bazeley and Gould in the thanksgiving for the Incarnation. In the South African anaphora the phrase is joined to the 1662 words 'and suffer death upon the cross for our redemption.' It is just possible that this phrase is to be traced to the liturgy of the Lusitanian Church.¹ Gould certainly at one time possessed a copy of this liturgy but there is no way of telling at what date it came into his possession. No reference is made to it amongst the sources used for compiling the proposed anaphora. The Lusitanian form of the phrase is slightly different from that used in Proposals, and it seems more likely that Bazeley and Gould used the Christmas Collect of the Book of Common Prayer (where the wording is identical) as their source. They may have borrowed the idea from the Lusitanian rite, though, of course, it was also to be found in several of their avowed sources. The Revd. W. Lockton, in reviewing the South African Proposed Form of 1918 (in which the phrase also appeared), recognised it as being part of the Christmas Collect, though he criticised it as an insufficient memorial of the Incarnation.² Lockton was apparently unaware that the phrase had also appeared in Proposals. The use of such a phrase, drawn from some other part of 1662, to express an idea found in the ancient liturgies, is exactly what one would expect of Bazeley and Gould.

There is one other part of Proposals, though not strictly of the anaphora, which has been taken into the South African rite - the words of administration. These are the same as the first half of the words of 1662 but with the curious omission of 'which was given/shed for thee'. Certain papers amongst the records of the Liturgical Committee suggest that the form was derived from Proposals. These are undated typescript notes which passed between Dr Phelps, the bishop of Grahamstown, and Dr Baines, the bishop of Natal. A letter

1. Cf. Pope & Clough - The Divine Offices of the Reformed Episcopal Churches of Spain & Portugal, p. 106.
2. C. G. E., Vol. LXXXVI, p. 345.

filed with the notes, signed by Phelps, and dated 'Grahamstown, 1919', makes it clear that the notes are comments made by Baines on the Alternative Form of 1919. Phelps was chairman of the committee responsible for the printing of the form and seems to have sent Baines something in the nature of a rough draft as prepared for the printers. Baines's comments suggest that the draft had gone beyond the printing commission's terms of reference at several points. The commission had been doing its work largely, if not entirely, by correspondence. Phelps, as the bishop on the spot (for the form was printed by Crocett and Sherry of Grahamstown) would certainly have had to bear most of the responsibility for the details of the draft. On the form of administration Baines wrote,

Was not the alternative proposal here made [i.e. to have an invitation beginning 'Draw near and receive..' followed by the shortened words of administration.] considered and rejected by [Episcopal] Synod? If so it is not in the power of the printing commission to consider it. The same, I think, is true if the proposal was not considered by Synod.

[An almost indecipherable note in pencil in the margin seems to read, 'I thought rejected'.]

If however the majority of the printing commission do not agree with me then I would ask:

1. Whether in the new form of service the invitation [i.e. the shorter exhortation] as it stands in the Prayer Book has been omitted,

2. and, if it has not been omitted, whether the introduction of the words 'Draw near' in the alternative proposal is not open to the objection that they are a repetition of what has already been said?

Personally I should prefer the resolution of the Episcopal Synod, which was confirmed by the Provincial Synod of 1915¹ to stand, and to be included in a rubric at the end of the service.

In the event the alternative form of administration was not introduced into the South African revision until 1920. The 1919 form simply contained a rubric such as Baines had suggested. But the proposal to adopt the shorter words must have come from Phelps. Phelps had been a member of

¹ Supra, pp. 19 & 35

the Grahamstown group who had originally sponsored the Proposals. The shortened form proposed by Phelps and eventually incorporated into the South African rite is identical with that of Proposals in the words of administration to be used. The invitation is slightly different but is derived from the same material as that used in Proposals. The implications seem to be plain.

No other parts of the present South African rite can possibly be traced to Proposals, but it is worth noting that the order of the various prayers in our present rite is the same as the order proposed by Bazeley and Gould. It is a sensible and natural order and its adoption in the South African rite may simply be explained on the ground that a long process of trial and error showed it to be the best possible order.

These few small points of similarity, most of them capable of being explained on other grounds than direct dependence, may be felt to be a very slight result for the labours and ingenuities of the authors of Proposals. It may also be felt that some explanation should be given for devoting so much space to what may well be regarded as no more than a liturgical curiosity. There are two reasons for this. First, there is a persistent tradition in the Province¹ that Bazeley and Gould had a great deal to do with the shaping of the new liturgy and it has seemed right, therefore, to set their work in a proper perspective. Moreover the Proposals was the first and only entirely independent experiment in liturgical revision undertaken in South Africa.

There is another and perhaps more important reason for this detailed study of what is admittedly a by-way of South African liturgical history. Any tendency to 'date' either linguistically or theologically must militate against the

1. Infra. p. 169 ff.

value of a new liturgy. Part of the argument of this chapter has been concerned to show that the scholarship which issued in Proposals has not in its essentials been dated by the passage of half a century. Though one may disagree with many of the details in W.C.Bishop's original article, yet his main points, and those points which Bazeley and Gould borrowed from him, would seem to be such as scholars today might still approve.¹ These main points may conveniently be summed up as follows:

- (a) consecration should be regarded as effected by the anaphora as a whole and not limited to one phrase or another of the prayer.
- (b) the primitive form of the anaphora was a series of thanksgivings for God's creation and redemption of man; and
- (c) consecration ought to be regarded as God's answer to prayer in pouring out his power upon the elements.

This is what W.C.Bishop argued for and what Proposals tried to translate into terms of a practical, modern anaphora.

The proposed anaphora never won general approval, though it received some support. A report of the Grahamstown ruri-decanal chapter² mentioned it. The report begins,

The Lent Meeting of the Grahamstown Ruridecanal Chapter decided to meet in Committee of the whole Chapter to consider the subject:- Of the Sunday Morning Service, as submitted by the Bishop in 'Suggestions and Adaptations of Services, 1911.', and to consider the Proposals made to the Chapter by the Chancellor in introducing the subject.

This report was found amongst the papers of the late Canon Gould and is unfortunately not dated. It must, however, have been drawn up after the publication of the Proposals in October 1913 since the pamphlet is later referred to in the report. The Suggestions and Adaptations of Services mentioned in the passage quoted above is the bishops' schedule of 1911. As this was replaced in 1915 by the second schedule,

1. SUBIA, p. 48 - cf. infra pp. 199f.

2. The ruri-decanal chapter was composed of all the clergymen working in the Grahamstown area and must not be confused with the chapter of the cathedral.

Prayers upon Several Occasions etc.,¹ the meeting must have been held in Lent 1914 or, just possibly, Lent 1915. The report embodied suggestions for a revised Sunday morning service in which the pro-anaphora was an elaborate conflation of the Book of Common Prayer order for matins, the Litany, and the first part of the Communion office. The arrangement on the whole is an odd one. It starts as for Morning Prayer in the B.C.P. but the epistle and gospel come after the Te Deum, with the Benedictus as an invariable gradual between them. The rest of the rite continues in the same way, parts of the various offices conflated to form one new service. The chapter suggests that 'it was within the power of the South African Church to meet the needs of Native Christians by providing them with a Liturgy revised on the above lines with permission for its use, where desired by European congregations.' The anaphora of this proposed liturgy was to be the anaphora appended to Proposals. The scheme came to nothing in the end, but Grahamstown remained wedded to the idea that a new pro-anaphora might be composed.²

Bazeley and Gould's Proposals were eventually reviewed for the Church Quarterly Review.³ The review is short and favourable, if somewhat condescending, and it mentions the Grahamstown scheme for a new pro-anaphora. There is nothing to indicate who the reviewer was, but from the sentiments expressed he may well have been Bishop himself.⁴

All the proposals from English sources seem to be limited by the various editions of the English Prayer Book with supplementary suggestions evolved from the invention of the compiler: none of the writers seem to think it possible to go back boldly to the ancient liturgies.⁵

Later the reviewer condemns the Grahamstown pro-anaphora as an attempt to 'mix up the Divine Office with the Liturgy' on a

1. Supra, p. 35

2. Infra, p. 98

3. C. Q. R., Vol. LXXIX, pp. 208ff. (October 1914.)

4. Cf. Bishop's letter on p. 54 supra.

5. C. Q. R., loc. cit.

'Greek pattern, but made up of Roman materials.'¹

In spite of the fact that the only official recognition it ever won was from the Grahamstown ruri-decanal chapter (not a body clothed with any great authority), and in spite of the fact that the only publicity it received was from mildly interested reviewers, Proposals has, nevertheless, left its mark upon the whole course of South African liturgical history. When the bishops of the Province came to issue their revised liturgy they embodied in it the main ideas of W.C. Bishop and of the Proposals. The storm raised by the advocates of a 'Western' form of consecration² quite clearly shows how greatly the theology of consecration set out by Bazeley and Gould came to influence the anaphora of the South African rite. The preface to the Alternative Form of 1919 indicates that the anaphora was intended to follow a clear and logical order in which the theme of thanksgiving should predominate.³ This view of the proper pattern for an anaphora shaped the official policy in revision over the whole period until the form was completed in 1924. It was the real achievement of Bazeley and Gould that theories for which they argued should have so dominated the work of revision that nothing else managed to oust it, even if their own attempt to give those theories a practical application failed to be accepted as an official liturgy by the Province at large. Their influence in originating the serious work of revision merits clear recognition and must never be underestimated.

1. It is worth noting that similar schemes for conflating matins and the pro-anaphora were advocated in the 17th and 18th centuries. Cf., e.g. Baxter's liturgy in Hall - Reliquiae Liturgicae, Vol. IV, or the outline given in Maxwell - Outline of Christian Worship, pp. 138f. See also Maxwell in The E.C.P. and the Worship of the non-Anglican Churches, passim, on the tendency at that time for matins to take the place of the pro-anaphora.

2. Infra, pp. 115ff.

3. Alternative Form (1919) pp. 1 - 3, cf. Historical Records, p. 229 and see pp. 103f. Infra.

Chapter Three

In reply to the various criticisms that were made of their work in Proposals Bazeley and Gould published a joint letter¹ towards the end of 1913. In it they said;

We have ventured to offer a detailed suggestion; but what we hope is that the Provincial Synod of 1915 will appoint a committee to receive and consider all suggestions and publish definite proposals before the ensuing Synod.

In point of fact the provisions made by Provincial Synod were, as has already been noted, very much more modest than the authors of Proposals might have hoped. One of the most significant implications of their letter is that even Bazeley and Gould were beginning to modify their earlier revolutionary attitude to the Prayer Book. It may be that the radical revision suggested in Proposals had provoked a reaction against any kind of change. The letter continues, at all events, in a surprising vein.

There is substantial agreement amongst liturgical students (I) that the preface, 'the prayer of consecration', the prayer of oblation, and the 'Our Father' should be reunited; (II) that there should be some mention of the Holy Spirit; (III) that memorials of the Resurrection etc., are required by universal tradition.

In spite of the fact that this letter reiterates the main points of Proposals, it really represents a substantial concession to the school of thought represented by Dr Frere. It is true that the writers maintained that without recognition of the principle that the consecration should be a prayer of thanksgiving arranged in logical order, 'no work can be satisfactory or permanent', but they seem to have come to realise that such a principle could be embodied in an anaphora far less revolutionary than that of Proposals. The first of their three points might have come straight from Some Principles of Liturgical Reform². In the second, 'some mention of the Holy Spirit' implies a very different thing from the invocation

1. The letter was published in the Church Chronicle (the official journal of the Province), Vol.X.(1913),p.431. The pages of each volume are numbered consecutively so all that is necessary for an exact reference is the number of page & volume.
2. Cf. Frere - op. cit., pp.186ff.

of Proposals.¹ What is happening, surely, is that Bazeley and Gould are beginning to compromise with the approach adopted by Frere and the South African bishops. The process of compromise, indeed, continued. Gould, in particular, came more and more to accept what might be called the 'Frere pattern' for the anaphora until in 1927 he could write, in a memorandum addressed to Episcopal Synod,

The Prayer Book Measure (i.e. the proposed English rite of 1927) Prayer of Consecration is more logical, definite, beautiful and nearer to ancient precedent [than the South African] ... Still 'we offer here...everlasting salvation' is better than the corresponding phrase in the Prayer Book Measure.....Permission to sing Benedictus qui venit is a considerable gain [in P.B.M.].....Summary: If the much better Prayer of Consecration is given due value the Prayer Book Measure will be preferred.

When this memorandum was written the South African rite needed only the formal assent of Provincial Synod in 1929 to become fully canonical and Gould was arguing that it would be better simply to take over the English Book of 1927 rather than to proceed with the ratification of the South African rite. Bazeley was probably less compromising,² yet the letter which he had written with Gould in 1913, shows that there was at that early stage a 'substantial agreement' to which most of those desiring revision subscribed.

Less than a year after the publication of this letter war broke out. Fortunately the revision of the Prayer Book in South Africa was not one of that multitude of pressing ecclesiastical matters to be shelved on the pretext that the war was engaging the entire energy of the Church. Nevertheless it was bound to have some effect upon the course of revision. Men's attention was focused elsewhere and the machinery of church government was in-

1. appendix 1. infra.

2. infra, p. 174

evitably slowed down. The forces working for revision remained surprisingly active but their activities made less impression upon the minds of their contemporaries.

After the publication of the bishops' second schedule, Prayers upon Several Occasions, in 1915, Frere's and W.C. Bishop's were not the only influences to be reckoned with. But unfortunately as the situation becomes more complex, so the evidence upon which the history of revision is to be reconstructed becomes correspondingly more elusive. The records preserved in official archives cover this period only scantily.¹ A great many facts which ought to be established with ease are now merely a matter for hypothesis and conjecture, and even memory cannot always fill what sometimes seem to be quite obvious gaps. Priests of the Province who are now about the age of retirement, were not yet thirty when the serious work of revision was being done. Their knowledge of what was happening in the inner councils of the Church was not, in the nature of things, very great and it is astonishing how rapidly memory can fade. Thus no record of many events of the period now exists; other events can only be inferred from such records as have been preserved.

It is known that the Liturgical Committee must have received a copy of Proposals since there is one amongst the records of the Committee, but it is not known what the bishops made of the pamphlet. Proposals received a short notice in the Church Chronicle soon after it was published. Then nothing was done until the publication of the bishops' schedule of 1915 and after that no further move was made until Proposals was again reviewed in the Church Chronicle in the following year.² This time the reviewer was the Rt. Revd. W.E.Smyth, who had just retired as bishop of Lebombo

1. See appendix 7, infra.

2. Church Chronicle, Vol. XIII, pp.302f., and cf. Gould - The S.A. Liturgy, an article in the Chronicle, Vol.XXI, p.756f.

to become rector of a parish in the city of Cape Town. Bishop Smyth's article reawakened the interest temporarily stifled by the war. Correspondence provoked by what he said continued until well into 1917. Not all those who wrote to the Church Chronicle desired extensive revision. A leading article in the early part of 1915 had condemned any attempt to forward an independent revision in any single diocese or province within the Anglican Communion, even in the 'mother' Church of England. The bishops' second schedule was praised as being within the competence of one province; but the writer was of the opinion that independent provincial revision dare go no further.¹

Such caution was common in those who wrote in reply to bishop Smyth's review. There were those who thought that there ought to be no revision at all lest it weaken the links with the Church of England. On the whole, though, it is astonishing how little evidence there is of rigid objection to any kind of revision at all. No doubt there was a great deal of silent conservative disapproval, particularly amongst laymen. It would seem, for instance, that in the Provincial Synod of 1919 the whole body of lay representatives from the diocese of Cape Town were opposed to revision,² but very little of this implacable opposition was vocal in the early days and this was probably partly because of the war. After the bishops' first Alternative Form was issued in 1919 there were public protests against the 'proposals to tinker with a part of the Prayer Book, which it is felt should be the most jealously guarded of all.'³ And there was considerable, and very vocal, opposition in the Provincial Synod of 1919, led by Mr. T.J. Anderson of Sea Point in the diocese of Cape Town, who objected strongly to any kind of alternative to the Book of 1662. 'As to the alternative liturgy, he could con-

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XII, p. 182.

2. Ibid., Vol. XVI, p. 494. (Report of Provincial Synod).

3. Ibid., p. 350.

ceive of nothing more pregnant with the seeds of disturbance and heartburning than that.¹ The opposition seems to have found a good deal of sympathy and interest in the country at large. The East London Daily Despatch for 11 November 1919 carried the following report:²

The proposal called forth strong opposition. Mr. T. Anderson urged that going back to the old Prayer Book³ was merely a royal road to transubstantiation, and said it was a pity such a bone of contention should be thrown down at a moment when people were yearning for union.

After 1919 this opposition, with its fine command of outworn metaphor, seems to have died down, until in 1924 the final alternative form was approved, with only one dissentient.⁴ Apart from these few indications there is hardly a trace of violent opposition to any revision of the liturgy at all. It has been thought worth collecting what evidence there is at this point (though it strictly covers the whole period and is not all immediately relevant to the early history of the revision) so that its extent could be measured and the scantiness of references to it could be appreciated.⁵

The really widespread disagreement seems to have concerned not whether there should be a revision at all, nor even, particularly, whether the revision should be 'catholic' or 'protestant', but what particular type of ancient Christian model the new revision ought to follow. Quite apart from those who opposed revision, either because they feared it as 'Romanising', or because it might weaken the links with the Church in England, there were four different schools each working for a quite different kind of revision. There was the Grahamstown group inspired by the work of Bazeley and Gould. There was the Episcopal Synod following a more moderate policy. There were those who

1. Church Chronicle Vol. XVI. P. 494

2. That a local paper so far from Cape Town should report the matter in some detail is evidence of great interest.

3. This must be a reference to the 1549 Book.

4. Historical Records p. 199

5. See also the account of Provincial Synod 1919, infra, p. 122f.

advocated a thoroughly 'Western' type of revision, and there were those who desired the retention of 1662 with provision for 'enrichment' rather than revision. These last differed little in practice from the bishops in aims and ideals.

The ranks of those who are opposed to Prayer Book Revision are swollen by the addition of many who feel very strongly that the Book of Common Prayer, as it stands, is the bond of union between many members of the Church, however much they may differ in private opinion as to certain matters which have not been defined as articles of faith.¹

'Enrichment' was felt to be the answer. At one time, even, the liturgical committee was officially styled the Committee for Prayer Book Enrichment. The word was meant to convey a sense of improvement without alteration - if such a thing were possible. The article just quoted was one of a series written specially to advocate enrichment as against revision. Some of its author's ideas as to enrichment are rather odd. In another article of the series he advanced a most peculiar scheme for the conflation of matins and the Communion office, a liturgical exercise which seems to have been popular at the time. The service was to consist of matins up to the end of the second lesson, then the eucharistic liturgy, then the sermon, and then the rest of matins.² Thus with very few changes of the Prayer Book text, the services could be enormously enriched. These articles would be likely to encourage the bishops, the more eccentric peculiarities apart, to stand firm on the position of the 1915 schedule and to resist the attempts of the Grahamstown group to achieve something more thorough. On the whole the bishops and the 'enrichers' were at one.

The 'Westernisers', too, had been advocating revision for some time. Like Frere they desired a reunion of the canon of 1549, but for rather different reasons. The Revd. W.J. Alston of Pietermaritzburg in Natal³ was the first public advocate of a scheme to make the Prayer Book approximate more

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XI, p. 412.

2. Ibid., Vol. XII., p. 107.

3. See infra, p. 134

closely to the Roman rite.¹ Alston assumed that the Prayer Book was essentially a part of the Western tradition and could only be revised within that tradition. He also assumed that the basic common order of the liturgy in East and West was; Sanctus, words of Institution, prayer for the communicants, Lord's Prayer, communion, post-communion and dismissal.² 1662 could be arranged to follow this pattern by analogy with the Roman rite as follows:

Hear us, o merciful Father Who in the same night etc. Wherefore, o Lord, etc. Here we offer etc.	<u>Quam oblationem</u> <u>Qui pridie</u> <u>Unde et memores</u> <u>Supplices te</u>
(A memento of the dead to be recited secretly by the celebrant)	<u>Memorare</u>
And although we be etc. Our Father	<u>Nobis quocumque</u> <u>Pater</u>
(Fraction and <u>Agnus</u> secretly)	<u>Libera nos & Agnus</u>
Almighty and everliving God, etc. Peace and blessing.	Post-communion. <u>Ite, missa est.</u> ³

Alston's articles, though they stood alone as early public advocacy of Roman models, indicate that the outburst of later feeling in favour of 'the Western form of consecration' was not something new. Probably the Westernisers like the conservatives represented a large body of opinion, which was itself silent rather than vocal in its desire for its own kind of revision. Western influence was at its strongest in 1920 and 1921⁴ but it already existed even before 1918.

Alston's articles did not, however, appear until the Grahamstown group had again begun to press for a more radical revision. Further pressure was brought to bear upon Episcopal Synod. Canon Gould, in a brief account of the history of the South African revision written in 1924⁵, attri-

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XIV, pp. 353, 376, and 400.

2. Ibid., p. 353.

3. Ibid., p. 376.

4. See infra, pp. 166f.

5. Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p. 756. By some curious mistake the pages of Volumes XX and XXI are numbered continuously instead of beginning afresh for volume XXI.

buted the next move to a meeting of the Sacred Synod of the diocese of Grahamstown.¹ This view was commonly held, apparently. The Newsletter, magazine of the diocese of Grahamstown, in March 1918, said of the Proposed Form issued by the bishops in the same year;

At the last Synod of the clergy it was resolved that the Bishop be respectfully requested to approach the Bishops of the Province with a view to making certain changes in our Order of the Holy Communion so as to bring it into line with other liturgies of the Church. The result has been the 'Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy' which is now in our hands.

This simplified view of things, however, cannot be correct. The time factor alone would have made it almost impossible for the bishops, meeting in October 1917, to receive a request from the Grahamstown synod which had met only a month or two previously, to agree in principle to the whole idea of further revision and draw up a detailed revised service, all on the spur of the moment. Obviously the bishops had begun to plan some further step beyond the schedule of 1915 even before they received the request from Grahamstown. The minutes of the Episcopal Synod, in any case, make it clear that Phelps, now bishop of Grahamstown, had already prepared the way.

Phelps had become bishop in October 1915, just before the bishops' second schedule was issued. He had been one of the group which had sponsored Proposals. Like Bazeley, Phelps suffered from crippling and almost continuous pain. He had been hurt in a riding accident as a child and had been left with 'curvature of the shoulder and a shortened leg.' Archbishop Lang once referred to him as a saint,² and it is as a saint that he is remembered by a great many who served under his leadership. He loved small children; and curiously, in spite of his hunch-back, children usually loved him. He had come to South Africa to be chaplain to the community of sisters in Grahamstown and it was this office which he held

1. Gould repeated this view in Historical Records, p.292.
2. Pierce Jones - A Procession of Witness, pp.19 & 25.

at the time of the publication of Proposals.

Bishop Cornish showed wisdom by making Phelps Dean of Grahamstown when the vacancy occurred, in order that he might be better known to the general public in the City and Diocese. Having thus persuaded Phelps, much against his will, Bishop Cornish resigned his See, and the elective assembly had no difficulty in choosing Phelps to replace him.¹

When he had been bishop for a little over a year Phelps proposed at the session of Episcopal Synod held on 7 November 1916;

that in view of the dislocation of the Canon of the Mass in the Book of Common Prayer and of the unregulated and unsatisfactory custom widely prevalent of the introduction as secrets of portions of other liturgies, this Synod considers that individual bishops may rightly sanction, under careful control and supervision, experiments which may result in the Church of the Province acquiring a Liturgical form of the Eucharist more in accord with Primitive models.

The proposal was seconded by bishop Chandler of Bloemfontein. The influence of Bazeley and Gould's pamphlet is obvious, particularly in the phrases 'experiments which may result in... a Liturgical form ... in accord with Primitive models'. The opposition to Phelps's motion was such that he asked leave to withdraw it. He and Chandler then substituted another proposal which called for the appointment of a committee to discover exactly what powers Episcopal Synod had to revise the Prayer Book, to investigate the possibility of allowing some measure of experiment, and to devise some means of regulating interpolations from other rites. The very existence of this committee helped to make it possible for the bishops to accede to the request from the Sacred Synod of Grahamstown with the alacrity with which they did so.

By the time the Sacred Synod met, the correspondence and articles which had been appearing spasmodically in the Church Chronicle since bishop Smyth's review of Proposals had reached considerable proportions. One of these articles,

1. Pierce Jones, op. cit., p.21.

contributed by Gould and entitled The Revision of the Eucharistic Canon,¹ was later republished in pamphlet form for the special purpose of being circulated to the members of the Sacred Synod. The pamphlet is undated and bears no printers' name but a short prefatory commendation written by Phelps is dated 1 July 1917. This commendation runs,

As the subject of the Revision of the Consecration Prayer is to be discussed in Sacred Synod, I am glad that this paper should be circulated amongst the clergy, as I consider it will help the Synod greatly in its consideration of the subject.

The article represents a considerable modification of Gould's views as found in Proposals. Gould had already prepared the way for such a modification by publishing an earlier article entitled A Western Anaphora,² in which he advocated the adoption of a consecration prayer like that of 1549, but with the invocation after the words of institution and with the addition of a memorial of the Incarnation. This so-called Western anaphora seems to have openly followed the pattern of the Gallican masses³ for after the Sanctus comes the Benedictus cui and then a passage running, 'Truly holy, truly blessed, is thy Son Jesus Christ Our Lord, whom Thou, o heavenly Father, of thy tender mercy didst give to become incarnate and dwell with men and to suffer death upon the cross.' This has a distinctly Gallican flavour.⁴ The invocation of this anaphora was to be ;

Humbly we pray and beseech Thee, Almighty God, pour out thy Holy Spirit upon us, that we receiving this Holy Communion in remembrance of the death and passion of thy Son, may be partakers of His Body and Blood and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.

It is noteworthy that Gould has here preferred an invocation upon the worshippers and not at all upon the elements.

Gould's later article, Revision of the Eucharistic Canon, circulated to all members of the synod, repeated, though

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XIV, p. 212.

2. Ibid., p. 95.

3. Cf. pp. 62ff. supra.

4. Cf. 'In the bulk of the Gallican post-sanctus prayers it is Our Lord who is spoken of as "Vere Sanctus".' - Frere on the South African Proposed Form in Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p. 204.

very much more briefly, the main substance of the argument of Proposals. He was still moving towards a scheme of revision more sympathetic to the Book of Common Prayer, but he continued to base the theory of revision on W.C. Bishop's rationale of the primitive consecration prayer. Presumably because his article was popular rather than academic Gould did not give ~~the~~ detailed references to his sources until he came to deal with Anglican consecration prayers. The first Anglican recognition of the fact that the consecration prayer ought to be a prayer of thanksgiving, he finds in Thomas Brett's Collection of Primitive Liturgies,¹ and this, he says, was not really followed up until W.C. Bishop began his work.² The defects in the 1662 form, as Gould saw them at the time of the writing of this article, were that there is no thanksgiving at all except in the preface (the prayer of Thanksgiving being specifically for communion), and that the consecration prayer is broken into fragments instead of following one clear, logical pattern.

This part of Gould's Revision of the Eucharistic Canon is very much more like the sort of thing usually advanced by Frere than by Bishop. Gould indeed refers to Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, though without giving any specific reference.³ Again there seems to be an, at least tactical, acceptance of Frere's pattern for a revised anaphora in preference to the more elaborate pattern of Proposals. Gould cites as precedent for the longer 're-united' form of consecration, the 1549 rite and the Scottish rites of 1637, 1764, and 1910. He proceeds to a resumé of the Scottish

1. Brett, op.cit., (reprint of 1838), p. 309.

2. Bishop in C.S.R., Vol. LXIII, pp. 317ff., LXVI, pp. 386ff., & LXXX, pp. 359ff. But there were others, in the 17th and 18th centuries, besides Brett who recognised that the primitive consecration prayer was a prayer of thanksgiving. See Bingham (to whom Brett actually refers in the passage cited by Gould) in Antiquities (reprint of 1870), Vol. II, pp. 770ff. and also N.E. Thorndike's Works, (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology) Vol. IV, Pt. I, pp. 52ff. and see the lengthy anaphora of Stephens's Liturgy of the Ancient Christians in Hall - Fragmenta Liturgica, Vol. II, pp. 66ff.

3. But see Frere, op.cit., pp. 186ff.

and American consecration prayers and, again without specifically acknowledging his source, gives the rearrangement of the order of 1662 prayers advocated by Frere.¹ Gould points out that a very similar rearrangement had been agreed to in the lower house of the Convocation of Canterbury.² Finally he cites Cosin's well known remark about Overall as evidence of a long-standing Anglican tradition that the prayer of Oblation ought to be said before the communion.³ This concludes his summary of the evidence in favour of a longer and fuller form of consecration than that of 1662. Gould adds to his article, with an amazing facility for producing anaphoras suitable to every occasion, a new proposed scheme for a revised South African consecration prayer.

Sanctus.

All glory and thanksgiving be to Thee, Almighty God our Heavenly Father ..(continuing as 1662)...thine only Son Jesus Christ to become incarnate and to suffer death ... (as 1662)...in remembrance of me. Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the blessed passion and precious death, the mighty resurrection and glorious ascension of thy dear Son, entirely desire ... (as in 1662)... lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee to pour out thy Holy Spirit upon us, that all we who are partakers...(as 1662) ... world without end. Amen.

This was the third order of consecration prayer to have been proposed by Gould and is even less revolutionary than his so-called 'Western anaphora'. It is of considerable importance in connection with the Proposed Form of 1918.

By the time that the article containing this third anaphora was circulated to the clergy of the diocese of Grahamstown a motion had already been set down on the agenda paper of the Sacred Synod requesting the bishops to permit;

(1) the re-arrangement of the Holy Communion so as to go Preface; Sanctus; Consecration Prayer; Prayer of Humble Access; Communion; Prayer of Thanksgiving.

1. In Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, pp. 188ff.

2. See Jasper - Walter Howard Page, p. 58.

3. Gould does not give a reference but see Parker's Introduction to the Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer, pp. ccxxiii, f.

(2) the insertion of memorials of the great events in the work of our redemption such as are found in most other liturgies of the Church.

Bishop Phelps presided at the synod and there can be little doubt that he would have encouraged members to take a favourable view of the resolution. This was introduced by the dean, Bernard Williams, and seconded by the archdeacon of Port Elizabeth, A.T. Wirgman. Dr Wirgman was a colourful and dynamic figure, the last colonial civil chaplain in the diocese. He was something of a liturgical scholar, having written, amongst a variety of other works, The Prayer Book with Scripture Proofs.¹ The book has a quaint, old-fashioned flavour to the modern reader and the views expressed in it have no bearing upon the course of revision in this country. Wirgman's speech at the synod was almost his last official act, for he died soon after returning to Port Elizabeth.²

The resolution seems to have met with general approval. According to the minutes of the synod, West, the chancellor of the cathedral and one of the Grahamstown group, seems to have spoken strongly in favour of the second part of the motion. He argued the necessity for a logical and straightforward anaphora for translation into the native dialects instead of perpetuating the defects of 1662.³ Bazeley, now warden of St Paul's, spoke too, reiterating his old argument that the 'do this' of the narrative of the institution must include 'give thanks'.⁴ Gould does not seem to have intervened in the debate at all and, although it cannot be definitely determined, it appears that he had already left the diocese to become a temporary army chaplain. It seems hard to explain, otherwise, why he should have kept silence on a matter for which he had done so much of the work. The

1. Benrose and Sons, 1873, and revised again in 1883.

2. Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p.756.

3. Cf. Proposals, p.16, where this point is made in almost identical language.

4. Cf. Proposals, p.2.

motion was eventually carried with only two dissentients and the request was forwarded to Episcopal Synod.

The bishops assembled for synod on October 17th. The report presented by the Liturgical Committee shows that the committee had been trying, not altogether successfully, to do its work by correspondence. Most of the report is concerned with prayers for the dead and is not relevant to the Eucharistic anaphora. The only matter not irrelevant is the final statement in the report.

The report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury is in the hands of the Bishops; it deals with the reply of the Convocation to the Royal Letters of business. It contains matter of real liturgical interest, and it appears to be of urgent importance that the Synod should consider it, and determine the attitude to be adopted to it. It [this 'it' must refer to the Liturgical Committee] recommends that the Bishops should refer it [the Convocation report], with their recommendations, to their several Chapters, and that the reports of the Chapters shall be considered at the next meeting of the Synod.

Your Committee desire to draw attention to the new phase entered upon by the Lower House of Canterbury in regard to the dislocation of the Canon and trusts that the Synod will consider the subject afresh and arrive at some definite conclusion on this very important matter.

It would seem, from the records of the Episcopal Synod, that the committee appointed as a result of Phelps's motion at the previous session of the Synod had taken legal advice on the Episcopal Synod's powers of revision, for after the end of the meetings of the Episcopal Synod the Archbishop, William Marlborough Carter, sent out a list of the proposed alterations to the Prayer Book² to which he appended a note:

-
1. Report of the Committee on Liturgical Enrichment etc. to Episcopal Synod 1917. The report from Convocation must have been Report No.504 which was in fact later sent to the Chapters. The 'new phase' must refer to the move made by the Lower House of Canterbury to re-arrange the order of the prayers in 1662 - see R.C.D. Wasper-Walter Howard Frere p.58ff. Substantially the situation had not altered by the time the 1918 Proposed Form was produced.
 2. infra p.85

I am not myself convinced by Chancellor Talbot that the fact that Provincial Synod might consider certain modifications in the Prayer Book Service to be for the general advantage of the Church of the Province constitutes 'a circumstance of this Province which requires modification'¹ of the Book of Common Prayer as we have received it from the Church of England. But assuming he is correct I should be prepared to sign the report.

Unfortunately it has not been possible to trace Chancellor Talbot's advice beyond this one reference, but the archbishop's letter makes clear that this legal advice had been sought and what the tenor of the reply was. On the other matter entrusted to it, the regulation of interpolations from other rites into the 1662 office, the committee was apparently able to do nothing.

The bishops in synod also received the request from the diocese of Grahamstown for thorough revision of the eucharistic rite. The result of their deliberations on these various matters was that the Synod decided it had the power, subject to the confirmation of Provincial Synod, to authorise departures from the Book of 1662, and it seems to have agreed in principle to the idea of revision and rearrangement. It appears to be unlikely, however, that the Synod decided more than the principles, and perhaps the scope and extent of the revision. Probably the actual details of the revision itself were left to a committee appointed by the Synod. The correspondence which passed between the archbishop and the other bishops suggests that the wording of the proposed departures from the 1662 Book had not been decided upon by the Synod as a whole. Dr. Carter's letter was dated 23 January 1918 and read:

My Dear Bishop,

I am enclosing a copy of the resolution passed at the last Episcopal Synod for the rearranging of the Prayers in the Communion Office, and also the alterations. I am asking the Bishop of Grahamstown what

1. see Constitution and Canons (1950) p.8 & cf. preface to the Alternative Form of 1919 p.1.

he thinks should be done now with regard to arranging some copies of the service.

I should be glad to have your opinion in the matter. I don't suppose that there will be any demand for any large number of copies as yet, and perhaps it would not be as well to print the rubrics etc. Any suggestion from you would be helpful.

The meaning of the first paragraph of this letter seems to be that the Synod had passed the resolution 'for the rearranging of the Prayers in the Communion Office', but not the actual 'alterations'. It was to this letter that the archbishop appended his note about Chancellor Talbot's opinion.

Phelps, as convener of the committee in charge of the revision, arranged to have copies of the service printed and the bishops of the Province made no further comments or suggestions on the alterations proposed, for the printed Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy¹ agrees exactly with the list appended to the archbishop's letter. Probably not many copies were printed, and certainly the use of the Proposed Form was very carefully controlled. In Grahamstown the position was that 'the Bishop has sanctioned the use of the new order at the Cathedral on two days a week, which days are Wednesday and Friday. Copies will be handed to those who come, or they can be purchased at 2d each.'² The bishop of St Johns, Dr Williams, who had been Phelps's predecessor as convener of the Liturgical Committee, sent out copies of the Proposed Form to the clergy of his diocese with a covering letter dated May 1918.

The proposed form for a South African Liturgy is circulated for the information of Priests in Charge of Parishes. It is issued tentatively, and I shall be prepared to give permission for its use experimentally and occasionally in certain parishes in order that the people may become acquainted with what is proposed. It must not be used without the Bishop's expressed permission.

1. Printed by Reginald Guest, Grahamstown, 1918.
2. The Grahamstown Newsletter, March 1918, 'Cathedral Notes'.

The new form, then, was altogether tentative and experimental, an indication of the sort of revision that might be attempted rather than a formal revision itself. It was, in fact, a 'proposed' rather than an 'alternative' form.¹ This fact may help to explain why the bishops were content to decide the broad principle and leave the details to the committee. If the Synod had already settled the details, there would surely have been no need for the archbishop some months after the Synod had finished its sitting to circularise the members with copies of the report of the Liturgical Committee and the details of the alterations proposed. In so far as the minutes of the Synod are clear and decisive, they support this view. The report made by the Liturgical Committee in October 1917 contained no references to particular changes in the rite, but asks the bishops to consider the matter of revision and make it possible for their chapters to review the situation.² Yet the archbishop attached to his letter a list of proposed changes headed Report of the Committee on Deviations from the Book of Common Prayer. The report is not dated, but it is hard to believe that it had been presented in October 1917 at the same time as a report calling for general consideration of the whole question of revision. There was no other session of Episcopal Synod before the archbishop wrote his letter, so it seems that the committee must have produced the report containing detailed proposals for revision some time between October 1917 and January 1918, when the archbishop's letter was written. There would hardly have been time for the bishops to have drawn up the Proposed Form during the session of the Synod itself. It seems far more likely that the course of events was something like this:
 Episcopal Synod met in October 1917 and received a report

1. Subsequent revisions were entitled An Alternative Form etc.

2. See SUPRA, p.84

from the committee which drew their attention to Report No. 504 of Convocation and asked them to submit this to the diocesan chapters for consideration. But Report No. 504 contained no suggestions for revising the eucharistic liturgy so the bishops were further asked to make some suggestion themselves on this part of the service.

The bishops did not draw up a detailed revised form for the liturgy at Synod, for that would have left some unmistakable record in the minutes, but agreed in principle to the order of the rearrangement of the rite and referred the details to the committee.

The committee drew up the Proposed Form between October 1917 and January 1918 and sent it to the archbishop who circulated it amongst the bishops of the Province and then arranged to have it printed.

The Proposed Form was then issued for experimental use and submitted to the diocesan chapters for consideration.

The Proposed Form left the first part of the service untouched, though according to one of the schedules attached to the archbishop's letter the committee had proposed to allow the summary of the Law or the threefold Kyrie to be used instead of the Decalogue. The form begins with the rubric, 'The service to the end of the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church, as in the Book of Common Prayer. After which the Priest shall proceed, saying ...' Thereafter the order is:

Sursum Corda as in 1662
Preface and Sanctus
 1662 Prayer of Consecration
 Prayer of Oblation
 Lord's Prayer
 Short Exhortation, Confession, Absolution, &
 Comfortable Words.
 Prayer of Humble Access
 Communion.

This was not the order of prayers as requested by the Sacred Synod of the diocese of Grahamstown, whose proposed order agreed with that approved by the lower house of the Convocation of Canterbury.¹

The new anaphora, the basis of which was the 1662 prayers of consecration and oblation, contained several new phrases and clauses. It opened with the words 'All glory

1. See supra, p. 82

and thanksgiving be to Thee..', more or less what is found in the Scottish and American prayers. The rest of the 1662 prayer of consecration was unchanged except for the addition of the phrase 'to take our nature upon him and', from Proposals. The link with the prayer of Oblation was the customary 'Wherefore', almost invariable in Anglican revisions of the anaphora and suggested inter alia by Frere in Some Principles of Liturgical Reform.¹ The Proposed Form², indeed, to a very large extent completed the work of remodelling the 1662 rite on the lines suggested by Frere in this book. The bishops' schedules of 1911 and 1915 followed Frere's pattern for revision.³ The Proposed Form continued the same policy and it was only, in the end, produced at all because the official reports of the English convocations contained no specific provision for a revised Communion office.⁴ The fact that the Proposed Form is an application of the conservative scheme for revision suggested by Frere in 1911, makes Gould's acceptance of Frere's pattern for the anaphora a matter of considerable importance.⁵ Gould's influence on the 1918 form was very marked, as will be shown, but it could not have been so had Gould not already shown that he was willing to modify the revolutionary attitude that he and Bazeley had adopted in Proposals.

The prayer of Oblation in the 1918 form contains an anamnesis, 'having in remembrance the blessed Passion and precious Death, the mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension of thy dear Son, and looking for his coming again with power and great glory'. These words are used in the Scottish rite and were borrowed from that source for the anaphora of Proposals. The 1918 form also contained an invocation, '.. that thy Holy Spirit may be poured upon us that all we

1. Frere, op. cit., p. 192.

2. For the text of the anaphora of the Proposed Form see appendix 2, infra. Revisions of the South African rite are always known by date of publication not by date of adoption by Episcopal Synod.

3. SUPRA, pp. 20 ff.

4. SUPRA, p. 84.

5. See SUPRA, pp. 71 ff. & infra, pp. 173 ff.

who are partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.' The words 'may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son' are from the Scottish rite and had already been used in the invocation of Proposals. Otherwise, apart from the protocol introducing the Lord's Prayer, the wording of 1662 is unchanged.

It is clear from the foregoing account that the bishops would be predisposed to accept these changes, (whenever they were made by the Liturgical Committee) simply because they so very largely followed the suggestions made by Frere in Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, by which the bishops had already evidently been guided in their earlier attempts at revision. In this sense the Proposed Form merely completed a scheme on which the bishops had already embarked. But in addition the changes would be likely also to commend themselves to Phelps and the Grahamstown group since so many of them reflect the spirit of the Proposals. Indeed in a very real sense Gould must be regarded as the author of the 1918 Proposed Form. The new anaphora echoed almost word for word the anaphora Gould had devised in his article The Revision of the Eucharistic Canon, published first in the Church Chronicle and subsequently circulated in pamphlet form to the members of the Grahamstown Sacred Synod.¹ The only additions to Gould's form were the three phrases 'to take our nature upon him'; 'looking for his coming again with power and great glory' and 'may worthily receive the Body and Blood of thy Son', and the first two of these are to be found in the anaphora of Proposals. The one which refers to the Incarnation is

1. SUPRA pp. 79ff.

happier than Gould's later suggestion¹ 'to become Incarnate' since it fits more easily into the rhythm of the 1662 sentence. In all other respects Gould's suggested anaphora and the anaphora of the Proposed Form are identical.

It is not surprising that Gould's influence upon the new form should be so strong. The order had been drawn up by a committee, which probably possessed considerable powers of independent action and of which Phelps was the convener. That Phelps was still favourably inclined towards the point of view held by Gould is evident in the commendatory note with which he prefaced The Revision of the Eucharistic Canon. Moreover Gould had considerably modified the plan for revision as first put forward in Proposals. He was no longer demanding anything so revolutionary. The Revision of the Eucharistic Canon is much more modest and much more limited by the traditions of the Book of Common Prayer². There is no doubt that Gould's later attitude would be far more acceptable to the bishops as a whole, and The Revision of the Eucharistic Canon was prima facie more likely to influence South African revision than was Proposals, even though it is a much less significant and less well documented work than the earlier pamphlet.

The impression that the 1918 Proposed Form was largely the work of the Grahamstown group, and of Gould in particular, is strengthened by the language of the preface to the Form. The preface begins,³

When Our Lord commanded us to 'Do this' He intended us to include among those things to be done, not only the Breaking of the Bread and the directions 'Take eat' and 'Drink ye all of this' but also the Giving of Thanks, since that was the first step in his own action at the Last Supper.

1. SUPRA p. 82

2. SUPRA p. 81

3. The Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy, p. 3

This argument is so typical of Bazeley¹ that the language might very easily be his. Again, the preface goes on to say,

The lack of thanksgiving in our present service has had the further result of obscuring the God-ward aspect of the Eucharist as a corporate act of worship, and has concentrated attention upon 'the altar rather than on the heavenly action; the Consecration seems to be the work of the Celebrant, to the exclusion of the offering Church' (Frere).

This quotation presents in summary form the spirit of the 1918 rite. That rite was almost certainly the work of the Grahams-town group, whose views in turn had by this time been considerably modified by those of Frere and had therefore become more generally acceptable to the province at large.

The preface ended by claiming for the Proposed Form,

- I. that it contains the thanksgivings referred to above.
- II. that it is much easier to explain, owing to the continuity of subject in each part.
- III. That it makes clear the fact that corporate worship is an essential of the Eucharist.
- IV. that it makes no change in the Doctrine of our Church since the significant phrases of the service remain unaltered.

It was at this point in the history of the South African rite that the two fundamental themes of Proposals - logical order and emphasis upon thanksgiving - became part of the anaphora. From 1918 it was the official policy of the revisers that the consecration should exhibit these two features, and undoubtedly it was Phelps who was the link between Proposals and the Proposed Form.

Chapter Four

A copy of the Proposed Form was sent to Frere. It was probably Phelps who asked him for his comments on the form, though it is always a little difficult to tell for whom documents sent to the committee were intended. Since all the members of the Liturgical Committee at this time were bishops, letters which begin simply 'My dear Bishop' or 'My Lord Bishop' might have been meant for any of them. Phelps was convener of the committee, however, and it is probable that Frere's letter was sent to him in the first place. In the later stages of the revision of the South African Prayer Book Frere's contact with the Liturgical Committee was through the two bishops who had connections with Mirfield, the headquarters of Frere's community; bishop Nash, the co-adjutor bishop of Cape Town and a member of the community, and bishop Talbot of Pretoria whose brother succeeded Frere as superior of the C.R. In 1918, however, Talbot was not yet a bishop, and Nash had only just become one.

Frere addressed a memorandum, dated 1 August 1918, to the Episcopal Synod. It was a cyclostyled document of several pages, dealing in detail with the Proposed Form. The memorandum is printed in extenso in R.C.D.Jasper's Walter Howard Frere¹ and a copy is preserved amongst the papers of the Liturgical Committee. Frere's suggestions were that,

- 1) The salutation should be restored to the sursum corda.
[This was done in the 1919 Alternative Form.]
- 2) In the Preface the words 'O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty Everlasting God' should read 'O Holy Lord, Almighty Father, Everlasting God.' [This has never been done]
- 3) In the Sanctus the form should run 'Holy, Holy, Holy.... full of thy glory. Hosanna in the Highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the Highest.'
[This, too has never been part of any South African revision.]

1. Jasper, op.cit., pp. 203ff. and also in part in Arnold - Anglican Liturgies, pp.189ff.

On the third of these points Frere's argument was,

The Hosanna, Benedictus and Hosanna repeat seem originally to have been taken from Ps. cxviii through the account of the triumphal entry to a place immediately before the Communion; and thence to have been transferred and brought into conjunction with the Sanctus. Thus they hold this position not only in the Roman rite but also in the Gallican, the Syrian, and the Byzantine. This being so, it seems highly desirable that they should be restored in our Order to that position. The only alternative is to end the Sanctus as it ended before this addition, viz. at the words 'Full of thy Glory.'¹

South African opinion on this point was divided. Gould, for example, had accepted the idea that the Benedictus should be restored even before Frere wrote his memorandum,² but Hazeley probably never accepted it.³ In the event, the South African rite reflected Hazeley's view rather than Gould's; but that was probably owing to nothing more than to the consistent desire of the revisers to change as little of the people's part of the liturgy as possible.⁴

Frere's next point is consequent upon his proposal to reunite Sanctus and Benedictus qui venit. It was,

4)The prayer following the Sanctus ought, on the basis of parallels in the Gallican masses, to start 'Holy in truth art thou (and blessed in truth), O Almighty God ..' (i.e. vere sanctus, vere benedictus) [This, too, had already been suggested by Gould in 1917⁵ but has never been adopted, presumably because of the absence of the Benedictus.]

5)In the Prayer of Oblation the invocation of the Holy Spirit should follow closely upon the mention of the second coming. [This suggestion was carried out in the 1919 form.]

6)The offering of the gifts should follow some such form as 'Wherefore O Lord glory, do offer unto thy Divine Majesty these sacred gifts and creatures of thine own, this holy bread of eternal life, this cup of everlasting salvation.' [This was incorporated in the form of 1919 and the phrase 'these sacred gifts and creatures of thine own' became one of the most bitterly contested points in the whole revision.]

7 & 8)The Invocation ought to fulfil two conditions (a)that it should be explicit as to the reality of the consecration and should therefore contrast 'bread' and 'wine' with the consecrated Body and Blood, and

1. Frere - Rough Notes on the Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy, in Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, pp.203ff. Cf. A.H. Couratin in Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol.II, No.1. pp. 19ff. where it is argued that the original Roman Sanctus ended, after 'gloria tua', with 'per omnia saecula saeculorum.'
2. Church Chronicle, Vol.XIV, p.95, & cf. supra, p.
3. Theology, Vol.II, p.163.
4. Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p.756.
5. Ibid., Vol.XIV, p.95.

(b) that it should do so in a way that avoided the controversy between East and West as to the moment or operative words of consecration.

Frere does not say how it is possible to have an invocation which fulfils both these conditions. Any form which contrasts strongly 'bread' and 'wine' with 'Body' and 'Blood' is almost bound to suggest that the change is taking place at the moment when these words are recited. Frere gave a great many examples of invocations, most of them of the Gallican type, and he suggested two possible forms himself, neither of which really fulfils the two conditions which he had laid down.

May thy Holy Spirit descend upon these offerings and hallow this oblation of the Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ Our Lord. &

Entreating thee to send from high heaven thy Holy Spirit to sanctify our offerings and to hallow these our v w s; that by the dew of his grace this mystery of the Body and Blood of thy Son may be available for the healing of our souls.

The phrase 'hallow this oblation' was part of the invocation of the 1919 South African form, but otherwise Frere's wording was not followed.

Frere made two last points;

9) The Lord's Prayer ought to have some special eucharistic ending, either (a) the Doxology, which should then be removed from all other places where the prayer occurs, or (b) a prayer of the Libera Nos type.

In the 1919 rite the Lord's Prayer was printed with the doxology but the prayer of Humble Access was adapted to serve as a Libera nos prayer also. From 1920 onwards the second device was dropped - not surprisingly since the two suggestions are obviously alternatives - and the bishops adopted the other scheme, retaining the doxology here and omitting either it or the whole Lord's Prayer wherever else it appeared in the Prayer Book.

10) The Prayer of Humble Access might be made an 'embolism' to the Lord's Prayer by the addition of an opening phrase 'Deliver us from evil, and preserve us in all good, for we do not presume ...'

Frere said 'The suggestion has been made that the Prayer of Humble Access should be made a Libera Prayer...', and, in

fact, the suggestion seems to have come from E.G.P. Wyatt's The Eucharistic Prayer.¹

Frere also advocated that the penitential section of the service and the prayer of Humble Access (if it were not used as a Libera nos) ought to be removed from between the consecration prayer and the communion. He suggested that the translation of the Gloria in Excelsis should be amended and that post-communion collects should be provided. But these were not matters affecting the anaphora.

The Proposed Form received very much rougher treatment from the Revd. W. Lockton in the Church Quarterly Review.² Lockton gave the bishops credit for neither courage nor originality. 'The revision,' he said, 'seems to be based for the most part on the liturgy of the Scottish Church, though it is somewhat more conservative.' His critical attitude may possibly be explained by reference to another article of his appearing in the same number of the Review. This second article concludes with this judgement on the 1662 rite;

Consequently more than that of any other modern liturgy the method of consecration is in agreement with scripture and the most primitive practice of the Christian Church.³

Like the authors of Proposals Lockton held that consecration was effected by thanksgiving, but unlike them he maintained that scriptural and apostolic traditions were against including an invocation in the anaphora. His criticisms of the Proposed Form chiefly concerned the anamnesis, since he held that in the primitive Church this part of the prayer contained no 'precatory matter'.

It is a pity distinct ideas have been confused and it would have been better to have left the 'prayer of oblation' in its present, and most suitable, position, and if thought desirable, to have composed a new anamnesis form.

1. Wyatt, op.cit., p.63. The supposition that Wyatt suggested this form is confirmed by Gould in Church Chronicle, Vol.XVI, (i.e.1919), p.269.

2. C.Q.R., Vol.LXXXVI, pp.345ff.

3. ibid., p.332

The Bishops have rightly concluded that the addition of any Epiclesis of the Holy Ghost upon the elements after the words of Institution would involve an alteration in doctrine, and that there is very little precedent for one before this narrative.

There seems to be no precedent for an Epiclesis that He may come upon the communicants alone, and it is difficult to see the need of such a prayer after the collect for purity at the beginning of the service. ¹

Reference has already been made to the criticism of the memorial of the Incarnation which Lockton included in his article.² Bazeley and Gould might not have agreed with the emphasis Lockton placed upon the words of Institution, with his eulogies of the 1662 rite, or with his criticisms of the idea of an invocation; with his insistence on a proper memorial of the Incarnation and his desire to see a full anamnesis of eucharistic rather than 'precatory matter' they would have been in full accord. Lockton, too, deplored the fact that the Proposed Form contained no memorial of creation, one of the earliest elements, as he maintained, in the whole of the eucharistic prayer.

Lockton's suggestions for further revision were to substitute 'Truly Holy art Thou ..' for the more usual 'All glory and thanksgiving be to Thee..' at the beginning of the prayer³ and to remove 'Hear us, o merciful Father etc.' to the offertory. He also suggested that;

When a second consecration is necessary the words repeated should begin with the relative 'who in the same night' to make it plain that the fresh consecration is not really independent of the great thanksgiving, but that the priest consecrates 'according to the form before prescribed', so that the entire eucharistic prayer is pre-supposed, though rightly as the eucharist is one there is no repetition of it as a whole. ⁴

If Lockton's remarks had been more widely read, and their substance accepted in South Africa, some of the unpleasant and violent controversy of 1920 and 1921 might have been avoided

1. Lockton in C.Q.R., Vol. LXXXVI, pp. 345f.

2. SUPRA, p. 65

3. It is curious how many people advocated an opening of the vere sanctus type. Cf. Gould, SUPRA, p. 80 and Frere, SUPRA, p. 94. Lockton desired this opening without including the Benedictus qui, hence the omission of 'and truly blessed'.

4. Lockton, op. cit., p. 348.

though perhaps it is doubtful whether a suggestion as sensible as this would have been convincing at a time when emotions had been roused by argument. Lockton's article does not seem to have had any effect upon revision at all.

In the meantime the bishops had referred the Proposed Form, together with Report No. 504 of the Convocation of Canterbury, to their chapters as the Liturgical Committee had recommended. Since the Report did not contain any references to the eucharistic liturgy apart from the propers, the chapters of the dioceses of Cape Town, Grahamstown, and St Johns made very few recommendations on that part of the Prayer Book. A digest of the reports from these three dioceses, combined in one document and circulated to all members of the Episcopal Synod, is still in existence. There are a few suggestions touching other parts of the eucharist but none on the anaphora. Grahamstown asked for a new pro-anaphora¹, and all three chapters dealt fully with the prefaces and other propers. The most valuable reply, in a study of the history of the South African anaphora, came from the diocese of Pretoria. In those days this diocese covered the whole of the civil province of the Transvaal, and has since been divided into the two dioceses of Pretoria and Johannesburg.

There was, indeed, no chapter at all in that diocese and its functions were performed by the bishop's senate. Diocesan chapters in the Church of the Province have a curious and unique position. The dean is the only one of the canons who is a residentiary, and he acts as rector and parish priest. The bishop is the head of the capitular body and the bishop appoints the dean as he appoints every parish priest in the diocese. The archdeacons, too, are nominees of the bishop. The other canons, three or four in number, are elected

1. See SURKS, p. 69

in various ways, sometimes by the chapter itself, sometimes by the whole body of clergy in the diocese. The duties of the chapter are to advise the bishop in the administration of the diocese, rather than to govern the cathedral. In provincial and diocesan affairs the chapters have a recognised constitutional position and their members have a fixed place in the order of precedence of the Province.¹ In the dioceses of Pretoria, Johannesburg, and Kimberley the bishop's senate replaces the chapter as a permanent diocesan advisory board.²

It was to a committee of the bishop's senate that the bishop of Pretoria referred Report No 504 and the Proposed Form. This committee was appointed, as appears from the final report issued by it, on 13 November 1918. The committee consisted of seven clergymen with the Revd. Father Francis Hill, C.R. as Chairman and the Revd. G.H. Ridout as secretary. Ridout was probably the best liturgical scholar on the committee. 'That he could without warning take any part in any Christian rite ... would certainly have been true of Ridout as regards Western rites.'³ The committee's terms of reference were:

1. To make suggestions in regard to Prayer Book revision in South Africa
2. To consider the question: Should there be a diocesan use, and if so, of what nature should it be?
3. To make suggestions for a new rite for Adult Baptism.⁴

The final report was a voluminous cyclostyled document reviewing the whole Prayer Book, and it amounted to a complete and independent scheme for revision. It followed the arrangement of Report No. 504, made detailed suggestions for every part of every service, and covered even those sections of the book not dealt with in the Report.

This immensely detailed review of the Prayer Book was

1. See Constitution & Canons (1950), pp. 58 & 105. The statutes of the Grahamstown chapter are on pp. 80 - 85 of the Acts & Resolutions (Synod of Grahamstown, 1945).
 2. Cf. Historical Records, p. 612.
 3. Pierce Jones - A Procession of Witness, p. 73.
 4. Report to the Lord Bishop of Pretoria, Pt. I. (31 Jan. 1919), p. 1.

submitted to Dr. Furse, the bishop of Pretoria. The report is dated 31 January 1919. The fact that the report was of such great length and was issued when the next session of Episcopal Synod was only a fortnight away, led the bishop to ask the committee to 'summarise the recommendations of their report and to suggest the best method of introducing to the Episcopal Synod the most urgent of the reforms recommended.'¹ Accordingly the committee met again on February 13th (only four days before Episcopal Synod was due to assemble) and issued a short second report recommending:

1. That a further modification of services for optional use be submitted to the next Provincial Synod of 1919 in the form of a resolution.
2. That a committee be appointed by the Bishops before the Provincial Synod of 1919, to sit for at least one week, for the purpose of drawing up this modification of services for optional use.
3. That the modification shall include:-
 - (a) the order for the Celebration of Holy Communion
 - (b) a revised form of the daily office
 - (c) the Litany in a shortened form
 - (d) Prayers and Thanksgivings.

The long first report had been issued far too late to affect the decisions of the Episcopal Synod,² and, indeed, it covered a far wider field than the bishops were prepared to consider at that time. The real importance of the longer report lies in its effects upon events two years later in 1921,³ and even the second short report was not immediately effective. The only one of its requests to which the bishops acceded was the first one, which called for a further revision of the Communion office; and even without this request the bishops would almost certainly have issued the revised form of 1919.

This revised form, the first Alternative Form of the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion,⁴ was issued immediately after the session of Episcopal Synod had

1. Second Report to the Lord Bishop of Pretoria, 13 Feb. 1919.
2. Episcopal Synod met on 17 Feb. 1919. Gould (Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p. 756.) speaks of 'Episcopal Synod of 1918', but in point of fact the minutes of the Synod show that it did not meet between October 1917 and February 1919.

3. Infra, p. 160f.

4. Published by Grocott & Sherry, Grahamstown, 1919.

ended. For the first time in the history of the South African rite revision covered the whole of the service. The order of the parts of the new rite was to be;

Lord's Prayer
Collect for Purity
Decalogue, Summary, or Kyrie
Collect, Epistle, and Gospel
Creed
Offertory sentences
Prayer for the Church (revised)
Short Exhortation, Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words.

Sursum corda(with salutation and response), Preface, Sanctus
Consecration Prayer (extensively revised)
Lord's Prayer (with protocol and doxology)
Prayer of Humble Access
Communion (with provision for further consecration - in both kinds only.)
Prayer of Thanksgiving(introduced by 'Let us thank God for his unspeakable gift.')

Gloria in Excelsis
Blessing.

This is the order that Frere had suggested in his memorandum to the bishops. It was the also the order used by Hazeley and Gould in Proposals, and is the order of the present South African rite.

The principal source for the revision of 1919 was Frere's memorandum, Rough Notes on the Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy. All the additions made to the anaphora were, with two exceptions, suggestions that had been made by Frere. The position and wording of the oblation¹ and the phrase 'hallow this oblation' in the invocation were his. The two passages in the prayer not directly attributable to Frere were 'according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ'; and 'we humbly beseech thee to pour thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts..', the opening words of the invocation. Neither of Frere's suggestions for the invocation had been followed in full. It seems likely that what the bishops had done was to adapt the phrase just quoted from the Scottish rite and join it to Frere's phrase 'hallow this oblation'. The other passage

1. For the text of the anaphora of 1919 see appendix 3, infra.

not from Frere, 'according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ', appears in various forms in the Scottish, American, and 1549 rites, where it is associated with the words 'do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty with these thy holy gifts, which we do now offer unto thee, the memorial which he hath commanded us to make..' The omission of these clauses in the South African form certainly makes the prayer less clumsy. The Scottish form is again the probable model for the South African.

The Liturgical Committee had proposed that the anaphora should open with the words 'Holy indeed and Blessed art Thou, Almighty God our Heavenly Father..' ¹ Presumably the committee was attempting to use the Gallican form of the post-sanctus without adopting the Benedictus on which it really depended. Frere had mentioned some instances of 'vere sanctus, vere benedictus' being referred to the Father, notably in a Mozarabic mass for Easter, ² though even in these instances the Benedictus had preceded this phrase. But Episcopal Synod rejected this particular suggestion from the Liturgical Committee, preferring the opening 'All glory and thanksgiving be to Thee ..' The bishops also instructed the committee to draw up an alternative form of confession and absolution and have it ready before the session of Provincial Synod planned for the end of the year. ³

The Alternative Form carried a preface which was to be the model for the prefaces of all future editions of the form. Its argument is arranged under five heads. ⁴

1) The 1662 Book has been unchanged for 250 years and the need for revision has been widely felt throughout the Anglican

1. Cf. Lockton's suggestion supra, p. 97, Gould's, supra, p. 80 & Frere's, supra, p. 94. The proposal of the Liturgical Committee is contained in their report to Episcopal Synod - February 1919.

2. Cf. Frere's memorandum in Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p. 204f.

3. It was this directive which led to the misunderstanding between Baines and Phelps recorded on p. 66 supra.

4. See 'Notes on the Revision', in An Alternative Form etc, 1919, pp. 1-3.

Communion. The desire for revision is perfectly consistent with an absolute loyalty to the standards of 1662.

2) Legal advice had been taken and the Province has been said to be justified, under its constitution, in revising even where the reasons for revision are not exclusive to South Africa. The missionary work of the Church is one of the most pressing reasons for undertaking revision.

3) (This section more or less repeats the argument of the preface to the Proposed Form of 1918. The most important parts of it read:)

It is important to bring out the fact that the Service of the Holy Communion is the great Thanksgiving or Eucharist of the Church. In the four accounts of the Institution the giving of thanks by Our Lord is as important a feature as the breaking of the bread or the words of administration. The services which have come down to us from the Early Centuries of Christianity, as well as those in use in the Churches of our Communion in America and Scotland, show by their structure that, if the example of Our Lord is to be followed and we are to "Do this in remembrance of" Him, the note of Thanksgiving must be sounded more clearly than in the Book of 1661 (our present Book).

This note of Thanksgiving has always been represented in the Christian Liturgies by the Preface .. leading up to the Sanctus But in our Service after that point this note is not heard again till after the Communion, whereas in the older services the chief facts of Our Lord's Life and Work are made the subject of Thanksgiving.

In this revised service the whole of the central portion from the Preface to the Lord's Prayer has been, by some very few alterations, thrown into a definitely Eucharistic form.

This revision of the Service in the direction of more definite Thanksgiving helps to bring out the fact that the Eucharist has a Godward side as being the offering to God of a corporate act of worship and praise.... The present revision concentrates attention more upon the heavenly sphere in which the worship of God is accomplished than upon the earthly altar which is the symbol of the true, and the Offering made in the Eucharist is seen to be that of the whole Church and not simply of the Celebrant.

(Most of the rest of this section is devoted to stressing the logical order of the parts of the service in the revised form, and ends with the words:)

It is interesting to note that in other revisions of the Communion Service - Scottish, American and Lusitanian (under the protection of the Church of Ireland) - similar attempts have been made to repair the dislocation of the Canon.

This is the part of the bishops' preface which is most directly concerned with the theory of consecration and it will be clearly seen that the ideas of W.C. Bishop and of Frere

are both represented. The other points of the preface are attempts to explain practical details in the revision, except that in section four the bishops said;

The reunion of the Prayer of Oblation with the Prayer of Consecration followed by the Our Father makes it clearer
(a) that we must first present Christ and His merits before God as the justification for our approach
(b) that we must then present ourselves trusting in the merits of our Head
(c) that having thus been lifted up into the heavenly sphere we can say the Prayer which Christ taught us
(d) and last, because greatest privilege of all, receive Him who is our Life.

[Section five of the preface is an assertion by the bishops of their confidence that the revised form adhered loyally to the faith as received by the Church of the Province.]

The probability is that Phelps was the author of this preface. Reference has already been made to the correspondence which passed between Phelps and bishop Baines of Natal.¹ These letters are not accurately dated, but were written sometime in 1919. The vagueness is unfortunate since two editions of the rite were put forth in 1919 by Episcopal Synod - one in February, known as the Alternative Form (1919), and the other in October, known as the Alternative Form (1920) since the copies were not printed till that year. It is, however, easy to show that bishop Baines's notes referred to the earlier of the two forms. Some of the suggestions he made were incorporated in the 1919 form and would not therefore have been made after it was published. It would also seem that originally the form of 1919 was intended to bear the same title as that of 1918 - The Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy for the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist and the Administration of Holy Communion. Baines said,

The proposed title leads to the idea that there can be Eucharist without the administration of Holy Communion and vice versa. Would it not suffice and be less provocative if the title adopted was 'An Alternative Form of the Administration of Holy Communion'?

This was the title borne by the 1919 form which makes it

1. Supra, p. 66

quite certain that Baines's criticisms must belong to the early part of the year and must refer to the edition approved by Episcopal Synod in February 1919.

Baines's remarks on the draft of the preface were;

I. para.2. I suggest that the first three lines should read 'This widespread movement towards revision, which is consistent with deep affection for the Book of Common Prayer..'

II. I do not think that anyone has ever held that the Church of the Province [of South Africa] is precluded from 'any revision by its constitution', for revision 'required by the circumstances of the Province' is especially allowed.

III. I would suggest 'The question of the extent to which the Church of the Province of South Africa has power under its constitution to revise the Prayer Book has been submitted to an eminent counsel whose opinion is that, for reasons deemed adequate by Provincial Synod, the Prayer Book may be revised or otherwise altered. It is not in his opinion necessary that the reasons determining the Synod should be such as apply exclusively to South Africa in order that they may be adequate.

Baines had a further comment of importance to make.

I suggest that after the word 'clearer' [i.e. in paragraph 4, section 4, of the preface] the clauses should read
(a) that we must first present ...
(b) that we then present ourselves ...
(c) that having been thus ...¹
(d) and last ... receive him.

These notes quite clearly imply that Phelps, in preparing the 1919 form for the printers, had drafted a preface and that his composition was later modified by Baines's criticisms. It would certainly have fallen to Phelps's lot, as convener of the printing commission, to translate the resolutions of Episcopal Synod into a coherent, consecutive liturgy so that it could be printed. Episcopal Synod did not pass an entire liturgy en bloc. It passed resolutions amending this or that phrase, sentence, or prayer in an already existing rite.

Though W.C.Bishop's influence is still marked in the ideas expressed in the preface to the 1919 form, the language of the anaphora in that form is derived almost entirely from Frere's suggestions. If the anaphora of 1919

1. Cf. SURER, p. 104

had been virtually composed by Gould, then the author of that of 1919 was certainly Frere. Almost without exception the suggestions contained in his memorandum to the bishops were incorporated in the revised rite. The chief exceptions were the Benedictus qui venit and the cognate opening words of the prayer itself. It is even true to say that those parts of the prayer which had been taken over from the Proposed Form reflected the ideas of Frere, for Gould's anaphora, and the article in which he justified it, had been considerably influenced by Frere.¹ The result is that in the 1919 form Frere's authority could be cited for almost every point at which the language differed from that of 1662. It was Frere's anaphora. The first Alternative Form was the high-water mark of Frere's influence upon the South African rite. Thereafter it tended to decline as the bishops made one concession after another under pressure of adverse criticism from the province. Twice more Frere intervened in important matters connected with the shaping of the anaphora. He wrote a review of the 1919 form in which he lent the whole weight of his prestige as a scholar to the task of commending the form to the Anglican Communion as a whole, and to the doubtful in South Africa in particular.² He was also drawn into the 'epiklesis controversy' to defend the bishops against a charge of deviation from the normal traditions of Western Christendom.³ In neither case was his intervention entirely effective.

In July 1920 Frere reviewed the Alternative Form for the Church Quarterly Review.⁴ Not altogether surprisingly his attitude was extremely favourable to the new rite. The rite was, Frere said, 'a great advance upon the point reached by its predecessor and bids fair to provide the Province of South Africa with a worthy liturgy, and the Anglican Communion

1. Cf. SURFA, p.81

2. Infra.

3. Infra, pp. 152ff

4. C.Q.R., Vol. XC, pp.367ff., reprinted in Alcuin Club Collections No. 36, Walter Howard Frere, pp.123ff.

in general with a very valuable model.¹ Frere first gave a short account of the history of South African revision up to 1919 and then printed the new anaphora in full. Comparing this with the Scottish and American forms he said,

The form of anamnesis, however, avoids the heaviness found in the Book of 1849 and followed by the Scottish Liturgy... ..It avoids also any suspicion of a suggestion that some second action concerning the holy gifts takes place, over and above the one whole sacrificial action which is implied in consecration.¹

Frere complimented the revisers on the clarity and simplicity of the anamnesis and oblation, on bringing out the note of thanksgiving, and on the form of the invocation. On this last feature he wrote;

... the position of the Anglican liturgies in regard to this matter is a question of momentous and practical interest. The compilers have surely been wise in following the guidance of Gallican rather than Greek precedents.²

Frere went on to repeat some of the things which he had already said in his memorandum to the bishops about the invocation and then passed to consider the matter which occupied most of his article, the method provided for a second consecration.

As the opponents of the 1919 form were later to make devastating use of the rubric providing for a second consecration - commonly known as the 'third rubric' - this matter is of great importance. The rubric ran:

If either the Consecrated Bread or Wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Priest having consumed whatever remains in the chalice, and having placed upon the Table new oblations of both Bread and Wine, is to consecrate in both kinds according to the form before prescribed, beginning at Hear us, O merciful Father and ending at Do this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance of me.

Of this rubric Frere said,

... it does not seem desirable henceforward to end with the words of Institution, as was necessarily done when those words ended the prayer. If a second consecration is needed, the ideal is that the whole Consecration Prayer should be repeated. If it is thought preferable that the whole should not be prescribed, it should be tolerable to begin with

1. Frere, op.cit., p.369. This was not the view of those who later criticised the 1919 form-see infra, pp. 119

2. Cf. supra, p. 95 for Frere's suggestions based on the Gallican form.

the second sentence ... but the irreducible minimum should at least include the anamnesis and invocation. ¹

He went on to say 'A second consecration is an expedient which in any case it is highly desirable to avoid.' In the place of a second consecration Frere advocated that when the consecration wine was in danger of running out more should be consecrated by contact, either by pouring into it what was left of the consecrated element or by dropping in a fragment of a consecrated host. ²

The rubric in the 1919 form was indeed rather oddly framed. The words, 'the Priest having consumed whatever remains in the Chalice' provoked from Baines the comment, 'How can the Priest consume whatever remains in the Chalice if all be spent?' ³ The intention of the rubric clearly was that reconsecration should always be in both kinds. The awkward wording is easily explained. In order to comply with the terms of the rubric any remaining consecrated wafers might be set on one side while one or two new ones were blessed with the chalice, but it would be more difficult to do the same thing with the wine without emptying the chalice first. Since there were, apparently, those who, like Frere, held that wine could be consecrated by contact, ⁴ simply refilling a chalice in which there remained even the smallest quantity might have led to all sorts of complications. A further reason for directing the priest to empty the chalice might be that, while it is probable that if the consecrated bread is spent it will all be spent, it is very difficult to ensure that the chalice is ever completely emptied by the communicants. There comes a point at which there is hardly enough left in the chalice to communicate

1. C.O.R., Vol.XC.p.371.

2. C.O.R., Vol.XC.p.371 and cf. Jasper-Walter Howard Frere pp.88ff. where the matter of a second consecration is dealt with fully.

3. Notes passing between bishops Phelps and Baines cf. supra p.66-104

4. cf. Jasper op.cit. pp.88-91.

anyone normally and properly, yet some small quantity of the consecrated wine remains.

Baines's protest did not prevent the rubric being printed in the Alternative Form. Bazeley and Gould in Proposals had directed that;

If a re-consecration is required, let the Priest consecrate in both kinds, according to the form prescribed beginning at 'Our Saviour Christ..' and ending at '.. all other benefits of his passion.'

Here is the same insistence upon a second consecration being in both kinds. The Proposed Form of 1918 had said, more ambiguously;

If the consecrated Bread or Wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more according to the Form before prescribed beginning at [Our Saviour Christ in the same night etc.] for the blessing of the Bread; and at [likewise after Supper etc.] for the blessing of the Cup.

This is, of course, the rubrical direction as it stands in the Book of Common Prayer of 1662, even to typographical details. It is ambiguous in the Proposed Form, because, although the consecration prayer in that form was followed immediately by an anamnesis and invocation with the 1662 Prayer of Oblation, yet there is no direction to the celebrant where to stop when reconsecrating - unless the 'Amen' after the words of institution was regarded as a sufficient indication. The probability is that the printers were simply given a copy of the 1662 Book to follow in those parts of the service not specifically affected by the Proposed Form. And in the 1918 form there was no direction to re-consecrate in both kinds.¹

Besides his criticism of the rubric on reconsecration, Frere's article² included some remarks on the pro-anaphoral part of the new rite and compared the South African form of 1919 with the American Second Report of the same year. He had one or two suggestions for further

1. cf. infra p. 149 for details of the controversy over this rubric.

2. C.C.R. Vol.XC.p.372.

revision. The most important was a repetition of his earlier plea for a 'recovering of the long mistranslated and truncated Sanctus.'¹ But Frere's influence had already reached its zenith. The 1919 rite represented the full flowering of the ideas Frere had been advocating since as early as 1911. With the publication of that rite there began a gradual growth of open and vocal discontent with the 'Frere pattern' of the anaphora amongst the clergy of the Province.

The rite of 1919 was the product of a complex system and it is important to know what machinery and methods were used in the revision. The theory officially stated in the canons of the Church of the Province is that 'it belongs to the office of the Bishops to set forth modifications of Services to be used within the Province.'² Provincial Synod has, however, to accept these modifications, giving them the approval of the highest legislative body of the Church and making them binding upon the clergy. Therefore, in theory, alternative rites for the Province are framed by the bishops and accepted or rejected by the Province in Synod. In practice, however, the greater part of the actual work of revising the services has usually been delegated to a committee (or sometimes even to more than one committee³) of Episcopal Synod. Since these committees were specifically sub-committees 'of Episcopal Synod' it was natural that they should be composed of bishops, members of the synod. Until 1945 the committee was always so composed, though lay and clerical assessors were sometimes invited to assist the committee.⁴ In 1945 two priests were appointed to the committee; but the work of revision was virtually complete by then. The entire Prayer Book was passed by Provincial Synod for the second time in 1950. It was passed for the first time at the session

1. C.O.B., Vol. XC, p. 373 & cf. Frere's memorandum (1918) supra, p. 74

2. Resolution of Provincial Synod (1896) see Constitution & Canons (1939), p. 121.

3. Cf. supra, p. 84

4. See e.g. infra, p. 123

of Provincial Synod in 1945. Since article X of the Constitution lays it down that liturgical matters have ~~to~~ be passed, in substantially the same form, by ~~two~~ successive sessions of Provincial Synod, the Prayer Book could not have been materially altered after 1945, the year in which priests were first appointed as full members of the committee. During the whole of the time, then, that the real work of revision was being done the committee proper consisted of bishops alone.

The Episcopal Synod has not usually altered much of what the Liturgical Committee has from time to time recommended to it,¹ but has normally adopted the suggestions of the committee and accepted collective² responsibility for them. The amendments to the form as proposed by the committee and adopted by Episcopal Synod are then laid before Provincial Synod. If ratified by this body they are then 'put forth' by the bishops for provisional use in the Province.³ Provincial Synod accepts or rejects the recommendations of the bishops but, by convention, does not amend. It is too large and too clumsy a body to be able to give detailed consideration to each word, phrase, and clause of a rite; for mere practical convenience it must refrain from dealing with liturgical minutiae.

After Provincial Synod has accepted an alternative form for the first time, Episcopal Synod reviews the provisional rite each year and considers any further suggestions it may have received from the Liturgical Committee or from private persons. The usual practice in recent years has been for the secretary of the Committee to advertise in the provincial journal asking for criticisms and suggestions to be sent to the committee. After five years of experimental use and continual review the provisional form is again present^ed to

1. But cf. p. 160 infra.

2. See resolution of Provincial Synod of 1870, supra, p.25

3. Constitution & Canons (1950), p.12.

Provincial Synod. If the annual review of the provisional form has not led to any material alteration and if the form is passed by Synod for the second time it becomes a part of the law of the Church.¹

In practice, then, no revision can be effected without the concurrence of the bishops, who alone can make formal and positive alterations in the rites of the Church; while equally no such amendment can become canonical in the Province without the approval of Provincial Synod.² This body, however, does not initiate revision directly nor can it require any particular detail to be revised in any particular direction except by petitioning the bishops. The official titles of the various editions of the eucharistic liturgy are illuminating on this point.

1918: Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy for the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist and the Administration of the Holy Communion - as ordered to be printed by the Episcopal Synod of the Church of the Province of S.A.

1919: An Alternative Form of the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion - as proposed by Episcopal Synod.³

1920: An Alternative Form of the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion - set forth by authority for use in the Church of the Province of S.A. where allowed by the Bishop.

The full title of the final Prayer Book: A Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church together with the Form and Manner of making, ordaining and consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons - set forth by authority for use in the Church of the Province of S.A.

The careful balancing of the authority of the bishops and of Provincial Synod against each other has meant that revision can only be effected after a long period of experiment. That of the eucharistic rite was 22 years from the drafting of the Proposed Form in 1917 to the final ratification of the present rite in 1929.

1. By a sort of legal fiction the Provincial Synod is deemed to exist continuously. It is never dissolved, only adjourned. When the Synod assembles it is referred to as the nth. session of the Synod, not as the nth. Synod. Thus, although the composition may be entirely different, it is still the same synod. Sessions are normally held every five years.

2. But the bishops do issue certain forms on their own authority.

3. One reason for the change is given on p. 104 supra.

Two further points might be noticed. First, in spite of the practice of submitting each part of the Prayer Book to two successive sessions of Provincial Synod, some latitude seems to have been allowed if the alteration is a small one. Thus the order of the various parts of the supplication attached to the Litany were amended between 1945 and 1950 - though the words used were not altered - and this did not prevent the passage of the book in 1950. Secondly, the bishops do authorise and set forth on their own authority certain occasional forms (e.g. the consecration of a church and the admission to office of a lay reader). These are not a part of the Prayer Book, though they may be used in conjunction with it. The bishops, for instance, have issued a series of proper post-communion collects for use at the Eucharist, but these are not bound up with the missal or Prayer Book.

The system used for revising the Prayer Book¹ is in reality itself a product of the revision, rather than a rigid and preconceived method laid down before any revision was undertaken at all. For this reason examples will be found in this study which may seem to contradict some of the generalised statements above. Because the machinery used in revision evolved over the course of the years alongside the revised Prayer Book itself, some of the early stages were exceptions to the later rule. The account given here is only a general one; but it is also a fair one, so long as it is borne in mind that revision was not conducted in accordance with a rigid pattern laid down beforehand. The system remains, and the Liturgical Committee continues in existence, although

1. The account given here of the system is based partly on the recollections of the Rt. Revd. L. N. Fisher, at one time convener of the Liturgical Committee, and partly on a very brief account in the, as yet incomplete, typescript of a handbook on the South African Prayer Book, at present being prepared by the Venerable H. E. Wraige. Authorities cannot be given for some of the statements since they depend upon tradition and convention rather than upon canon law. Where some canonical authority can be given it has been indicated in the footnotes.

:114:

the work of revision has been , for the time being, completed. The South African Prayer Book, however, could be revised again at any time, if Episcopal Synod should see fit to initiate any further amendments.

Chapter Five

There were those in the Province who argued that the invocation of the 1919 form made nonsense of the whole consecration prayer. The two phrases 'these ... creatures of thine own' and 'hallow this oblation' were the centre of the controversy.

The difficulty is caused by a very natural desire to graft an Eastern or Greek Epiklesis upon a Western or Latin rite... The difficulty is this. The Greeks in the plainest possible way make known by the form of their service that the Consecration takes place immediately after the Epiklesis; while the Latins make it equally clear that the Consecration is effected by Our Lord's own words Now in our 'Alternative Form' the 3rd rubric after the Lord's Prayer¹ makes it clear that the Consecration takes place by the recitation of those words of Institution ... The question before the Compilers of our 'Alternative Form' was this, Is it possible to combine with this a Greek Epiklesis? It was possible; and it was done, let us say, by Archbishop Cranmer and his Committee in the First English Prayer Book. He did it by putting his Epiklesis before instead of after the words of Institution. ... There was no need to use the words 'creatures' (in the invocation) at all. But our 'Form' uses it twice in the same Prayer: and far, far worse actually after the Consecration (institution-narrative) But it may be said that the Consecration is effected not only by the words of Institution already recited, but by those words and the Epiklesis combined. I answer: No one can say this while Rubric 3 confronts him on the 'Form'.

These remarks were part of a paper 'read at St. Bede's College, Umtata, on January 8th, 1920, by the late Warden of the Society of Sacred Study at the Annual Meeting of this Society in the Diocese of St. John's.' The name of the speaker is not recorded, but he could have been no other than Canon J.E.W. Mason, Warden of St. Bede's, a theological college for African ordinands. Canon Mason was warden of the society, too, until he retired from St. Bede's early in 1921.² The diocese of St. John's corresponds in geographical area with the Transkei, an African reserve, and is, therefore, very much a missionary diocese. The clergy would have included a large number of Africans, some of whom would have been trained by Canon Mason. Mason's paper was cyclostyled and circulated

1. i.e. the rubric laying down the form for a second consecration.

2. I am indebted for this information to the Revd. D. Caton, present vice-principal of St. Bede's.

after his retirement, under the title quoted above. The fact that he is referred to as the 'late' warden in this title means that the paper was not 'published' until about a year after it had been delivered. That it should have been thought important enough to revive after so long an interval, together with the fact that at the time when it was delivered Mason occupied an official academic post of some distinction in the diocese, suggests that it was regarded as an authoritative, scholarly pronouncement and was well received in the diocese.

Canon Mason's views are quoted here, though out of strict chronological order, because they are typical of the argument used against the 1919 form. This argument became, in its essentials, the argument of all those who opposed the revised rite, but Mason presented it in its most concise and simplest form. The validity of the argument will be considered when the 'Natal Petition', the most scholarly and important of the attacks on the 1919 form, is dealt with.¹ At this point it is enough to say that the argument from the 'third rubric' breaks down because the bishops specifically directed that the celebrant in 're-consecrating' was to begin at 'Hear us, O merciful Father ...'. In this they could be accused of inconsistency,² but not of believing that the words of Institution were alone necessary for consecration.

The diocese of St. John's was not, of course, the only one which produced persons or groups who reacted strongly against the new 'South African Liturgy'. Indeed a great many people refused to allow it to take that name at all. Dr J.T.Darragh, one of the most hostile critics of the form, wrote to Frere in 1921, saying, 'I do not know how you came to consider it as a "South African Liturgy", duly accepted

1. Infra, pp. 135ff.

2. Infra, p. 150

and agreed upon. It is most certainly not so accepted and agreed upon, and is no more than a tentative and experimental document. There is not the least likelihood of its being generally received in the Province without some amendment of the language of the second Epiklesis.¹ It must be remembered that Darragh said this after Provincial Synod had, at the end of 1919, 'discussed in detail ... and adopted' the form.² One wonders what was said of it before it had received even that measure of formal recognition. Darragh also wrote, to much the same effect, to the editor of Theology, who reported that:

The Revd J.T. Darragh writes from Durban, S.A., to point out that strictly speaking the South African Liturgy, to which allusion has been made in our pages more than once, does not exist. There is a draft before the Province, which is not likely, he says, in its present form, to meet with the final approval of the authorities..... Mr Darragh's letter was written before our March number appeared and his point tallies exactly with what Mr Bazeley writes in the Lambeth Conference Review there published.³

As one of the things that Bazeley had said in his article was that the 'less learned dislike' the South African invocation 'as destructive of the ultra-Roman doctrine of Consecration by the words of Institution which is commonly taught among High Churchmen'⁴ it is unlikely that Darragh's point tallied with Bazeley's quite as exactly as the editor rather ingeniously declared.

The most important effect of the publication of the Alternative Form of 1919 was that it brought the whole matter into the open for the first time. Hitherto it had been somewhat eclipsed by the war and by the rejoicing over the armistice of 1918. Indeed, one angry critic of the new rite, the Revd. M.O.Hodson, wrote, 'No doubt it is unavoidable, but at present

1. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p.212. Darragh, of course, reckoned 'Hear us, O merciful Father ..' as the 'first Epiklesis!
 2. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVII, p.9.
 3. Theology, Vol. II, (April 1921), p.208. Bazeley's article was a review of revision in the Anglican Communion generally.
 4. Ibid., Vol. II. (March 1921), p.163.

the movement for revision resembles a knot of conspirators talking in a corner of a dark room.¹ Hodson, who was later to be one of the leaders of the 'Natal Petition' group, roundly condemned the 1919 form as a failure, and appealed for wider latitude in experiment. Other voices were now raised against the rite. Bloemfontein was the next diocese in which unhappiness about the revision made itself felt. Dean Hulme of Bloemfontein made a public plea for the transfer of the invocation from its place after the words of Institution to before them.² The reasons for desiring the change the dean gave as being;

- (a) that was the position of 'Hear us, o merciful Father' in 1662
- (b) that was also the place of the fuller invocation in 1549
- (c) the order of Our Lord's actions as recorded in the Gospels and in Corinthians in
 - (1) taking the elements
 - (2) blessing or giving of thanks
 - (3) breaking the bread
 - (4) saying 'this is my body'.

The third of these points must mean that dean Hulme thought of the invocation as equivalent of 'blessing' and that it ought, therefore, to precede the fraction in the manual acts and the words of Institution. But later he was to interpret the invocation as meaning something very different. Plainly, however, at this stage dean Hulme found the position of the 1919 invocation unsatisfactory. Later when the bishop of Bloemfontein (Chandler) had resigned and Hulme was vicar general administering the diocese during the inter-regnum, a great deal of criticism of the invocation was ventilated in the Church Chronicle. Hulme wrote again, this time to defend the invocation, giving an explanation of it which he claimed to have received from his old bishop.

So in our new Liturgy, consecration is taken as effected through the recitation of the Narrative of Institution

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVI, (1919), p. 269.

2. Ibid., p. 431.

and Our Lord is sacramentally present, we then later ask the assistance of the Holy Spirit that we may worthily present Him - the Lamb - to the Father. It is an extension of the preceding phrase 'we offer .. unto thy Divine Majesty.'¹

This explanation is interesting for its bearing upon the theology of the bishops,² but as an interpretation of the invocation it was unsatisfactory in every way. It did not satisfy those who objected to the invocation for it did not explain the word 'creatures' coming after the narrative of the institution. Nor did it satisfy those who defended the invocation. One would have thought that, in any case, the plain sense of the language was against such an interpretation. Hulme's explanation equated the word 'oblation' with the word 'offer' in the preceding clause. The invocation was thus seen as a blessing not of the elements, but of the act of offering. The phrase 'hallow this oblation' was, however, certainly interpreted by most people, whether in support of the new rite or in criticism of it, as meaning 'make this gift holy for us', and therefore as a part of the form of consecration. The Natal clergy went so far as to say, 'We cannot be meant to be guilty of the impiety of superadding a consecration upon a consecration.'³ The authors of the phrase certainly thought of it as being in some way consecratory. Bazeley attributed the whole of the invocation to Frere,⁴ but in this he seems to have been mistaken. Frere's suggestions for the invocation have already been given,⁵ and one of these suggestions underlies the phrase 'hallow this oblation' which caused most of the trouble. Of the phrase Frere wrote;

The compilers ... have good precedent behind them when they describe the Holy Spirit's outpouring upon the gifts in such a simple, reticent and non-controversial phrase as 'that he may hallow this oblation'.⁶

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVII (1929), p. 231

2. Cf. infra, pp. 197

3. Considerations on the Petition to Episcopal Synod, p. 5.

4. Theology, Vol. II., p. 163.

5. Supra, p. 95

6. E.C.C.R., Vol. XC, p. 370.

Frere, then, approved, though he did not entirely frame, the 1919 invocation, and clearly Frere understood the phrase 'hallow this oblation' (which was his own contribution) as referring to the work of consecration, though not necessarily defining the moment of consecration. The words 'the effect of the invocation' or other similar language is repeated again and again in his comments on the 1919 form.¹ It is true that he does not specify exactly what this effect is, indeed he advocates 'reticence', but clearly he does not mean that the work of the Holy Spirit is confined to sanctifying man's act of offering to God.

The word 'oblation' may have many meanings in the liturgy. In the rite of 1919 it is used in the rubric regulating a second consecration to describe the unconsecrated 'oblations' of bread and wine. The preface to the rite refers to the 1662 'Prayer of Oblation' as now forming part of the consecration prayer;² but the 'oblation' of the 1662 prayer is an offering of 'ourselves, our souls and bodies'. Nowhere is the word 'oblation' used of our act of offering of the Body and Blood of Christ, which is what dean Hulme's interpretation meant. It is true that the preface to the rite says that 'we must first present Christ and His merits ... then present ourselves trusting in the merits of our Head...', so, without doubt, the idea of some such offering was present in the meaning of the word 'oblation', but the word is never used elsewhere exclusively in this sense.

It would seem that Hulme later realised that his attempt at justifying the 1919 invocation was unsatisfactory, for in 1921, after the Natal clergy had petitioned against the form, he gave permission for all the priests in the diocese of Bloemfontein, of which he was vicar-general, to

1. Frere, op.cit., pp. 369ff.

2. An Alternative Form (1919), p. 3.

omit the two offensive phrases.¹ Thus there came into existence a mutilated form of the 1919 anaphora, sometimes grandiloquently referred to as the Bloemfontein use.²

Hulme's own account of this event is interesting.

May I state that I am practically responsible for the particular words connected with the consecration as now used? Perhaps our South African Bishops thought that ... they would follow their two sisters [in Scotland and America] and adopt an Eastern form of Consecration. So suddenly, in 1920, they issued a liturgy which, after what the Western Church had considered the words of consecration they went on [-the 1919 form of the invocation] Now I happened to be vicar-general at the time ... and I authorised the omission of ['these sacred gifts and creatures of thine own' and 'that he may hallow this oblation']. Thus there was no alluding to the Consecrated Species as Creatures, and there was no talk of hallowing the already hallowed; and the purpose of the Holy Spirit's co-operation was that we should 'worthily receive', i.e. make a good communion.³ What as vicar-general I granted the Bloemfontein clergy has, since 1921, been adopted as the authorised use of the whole Province.⁴

Hulme had, in fact ceased to regard the invocation as a blessing of the elements or even of the act of offering. It is now no more than a blessing of the reception.

However unsatisfactory Hulme's original ingenious gloss on the 1919 invocation may have been, it is evidence of the unhappiness caused by this aspect of revision. A great deal of the criticism of the Alternative Form was directed at this one point.⁵ When Provincial Synod met in November 1919 and the form was presented to it for approval, Synod contained, in addition to the evangelicals who disliked

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, p.118.

2. Ibid., p.183. The wording at this point was, of course, identical with that of the later official South African form of 1924.

3. It is difficult to see why, on this interpretation of the invocation, the words 'upon us and upon these thy gifts' were retained by Hulme.

4. Hulme - Blackwall to Bloemfontein, pp.220f. Hulme also said, 'A big liturgical authority in England [could this be Frere?!] said that the South African liturgy was the finest in the Anglican Communion, possibly in Catholic Christendom. I am glad that at the time of its genesis I was in a position of authority which enabled me to make alterations; and without which such commendation would, I think, have been withheld.' It is perhaps unfair to make too much of this chapter in Hulme's autobiography, entitled 'Liturgical Suggestions'. Hulme was a fine and faithful priest, an Anglo-Catholic in the tradition of the rather hearty 'social-gospel' Anglo-Catholicism of his generation. He had probably never been much of a liturgical scholar, and the book was written when he was over eighty. (The emphasis on certain words in the quotation is mine)

5. See e.g. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVI, pp.269, 309, 350, & 411.

any kind of revision at all,¹ a large body of the clergy who were highly critical of certain features of the bishops' proposals. The preliminary agenda of the synod contained the item;

The Archbishop of Cape Town will move 'that this Synod expresses general approval of the revised liturgy and hopes that before sanctioning it as an alternative form for optional use in the Province, the Bishops will take counsel with representative men of the other orders of the Synod, in order that relevant criticisms and objections may be fully and carefully considered.'²

The archbishop's unhappiness at the idea of revising the form at all has been already noted.³ The form which the notice of his motion took clearly indicates that the bishops as a whole were not hopeful of piloting the 1919 form through the Synod in its original shape. Since Synod was unable to amend,⁴ the only method the bishops could employ to get their proposals passed in the face of the opposition was to frame some such motion as this so that members of the Synod would be able to vote for the Alternative Form in principle, while hoping, at the same time, that it might be revised in certain details. The bishops were relying upon the support of those who, however unhappy they might be about the invocation, were delighted at the prospect of a revised rite in general. In spite of the bishops' apprehensions, the archbishop's motion was carried and the form received 'general approval'.⁵ That the margin of support for the proposals was of the very narrowest is indicated by the telegrams Gould received from Phelps and Bazeley. Gould was not a member of the Provincial Synod of 1919 but Bazeley was a representative of the clergy of the diocese of Grahamstown, and Phelps as a diocesan bishop was a permanent member of the Synod. The telegrams were:

General approval of liturgy passed Synod yesterday majority of three in lay house laus deo Phelps - November 11th, 1919.

General approval given to litkryw [sc. liturgy] voting by order Bazeley. - November 11th., 1919.

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVI, p. 494 and see supra, p. 74
2. Grahamstown Diocesan Newsletter, November 1919.
3. Supra, p. 84f. 4. Supra, p. 111
5. Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p. 756.

Provincial Synod normally votes by acclamation.¹ A division may be taken if any one member of the synod is dissatisfied with the president's ruling as to whether 'the Ayes or the Noes have it'. The rule for 'voting by order' is that it must 'be demanded immediately before the question is finally put' (i.e. before any vote by acclamation is taken - this method of voting cannot be used to defeat something which has already been carried by acclamation and division). This manner of voting is only likely to be demanded when it is known beforehand that the majority either way is likely to be a narrow one and when the matter is highly contentious. When the vote is taken the bishops, the other clergy, and the laity vote as three separate houses and the motion must be carried in each house.² The 1919 Alternative Form received general assent in each house, but in the house of the laity the majority was only three.

Synod also availed itself of the opportunity provided in the archbishop's motion to elect 'three members of each house to act as Assessors with the Bishops in the work of the Revised Liturgy.' The six assessors included Bazeley and Father Francis Hill, chairman of the Pretoria committee.³ It is almost impossible to say what influence, if any, the assessors had upon the shaping of the South African rite. They met with the Liturgical Committee immediately after the end of the session of Provincial Synod and reviewed the 1919 form. Further amendments to it were suggested. There is a scathing letter from Gould amongst the papers of the Liturgical Committee which suggests that the assessors were not particularly well qualified for liturgical work, though he expressly exempts Bazeley from this charge.⁴ Gould even doubted, and he expressed his doubts in the same letter, that the assessors

1. Constitution & Canons (1950), p.178

2. Ibid.

3. See supra, p. 99. For his views on the invocation, infra, p. 171

4. Letter from Canon C.J.B. Gould to the convener of the Liturgical Committee - dated 3 June 1933.

had ever met. But he is clearly wrong about this since the official report on the work done in Episcopal Synod in October and November 1919 reads;

The proposed alterations in the Alternative Communion Office suggested at the conference between the Liturgical Committee and the Assessors elected by the clergy and laity of the late Provincial Synod were discussed in detail and the form as amended was adopted. [adopted, that is, by Episcopal Synod] ¹

There is, in St Paul's College library, a copy of the 1919 form with 'suggestions for further revision' made in Bazeley's quite unmistakable hand. The copy certainly belonged to Bazeley at one time for it was given to the college by his widow, but the manuscript additions are not dated in any way. It is just possible that these 'suggestions' were in some way connected with the work of the assessors for there would have been no purpose in Bazeley's making notes for further revision in a copy of the 1919 edition once the meeting of the assessors had been held, for that edition was almost immediately superseded by the revised (1920) form. If these suggestions of Bazeley's were connected with the work of the assessors they had but little influence upon the changes made in the form. The only one of them which has become a part of the final South African rite was a proposal to omit the words 'militant here in earth' from the bidding before the prayer for the Church. Bazeley's suggestions for revising the anaphora were:

- (1) to alter 'who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full ..' to read 'who by his own oblation of himself once offered made a full ..'.
- (2) to alter 'a perpetual memory of that his precious death' to read 'a perpetual memorial of that his precious death and sacrifice.'
- (3) to omit 'Hear us, O merciful Father, Body and Blood' and to begin the narrative of the institution 'For in the same night

The first of these amendments was made in the revised form of 1920, ~~but has been changed again for the present rite.~~

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVII, p.9.

Episcopal Synod, then, received the suggested amendments agreed upon by the six assessors and the Liturgical Committee. The bishops had already assembled once before, earlier in the year, to issue the 1919 form. They now met again, in October and November of 1919, before and after the session of Provincial Synod.¹ The minutes show that the revised rite was considered on 25 November. Phelps proposed the new amendments which had come from the assessors. The bishops adopted the amendments and so the Alternative Form of 1919, approved in principle by Provincial Synod on 10 November, was superseded in just over a fortnight by the revised edition of 1920.²

As they affect the anaphora the amendments of November 1919 are trifling.³ When the revised form had been published Gould wrote, 'Not a letter, not a point, has been changed in the most criticised passage, the anamnesis and invocation'.⁴ The form as a whole differed from its predecessor in several details. The salutation and response were inserted before the collect; the words 'militant here in earth' were omitted before the prayer for the Church. The prayer of Humble Access was restored to its original form. 'Unimportant changes,' Bazeley wrote, 'may provoke more opposition than important ones - e.g. the attempt to make the Prayer of Humble Access an embolism was most unpopular and the Bishops wisely removed the connecting words...'⁵ There had undoubtedly been a great deal of opposition to this use of the prayer of Humble Access.

1. For references to the proceedings of Provincial Synod see the very brief account in Historical Records, p.292, Gould's remarks in Church Chronicle, Vol.XXI, p.756, & supra, p.74
 2. It must be remembered that editions of the liturgy are dated according to the year of their publication. The Alternative Form of the Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion approved by Episcopal Synod in Nov. 1919 was published by Grocott & Sherry of Grahamstown early in 1920.
 3. The text of the anaphora of 1919 is given in appendix 3 infra.
 4. Church Chronicle, Vol.XVII, p.155.
 5. Theology, Vol.II, p.162.

In our Alternative Form the priest is ordered to kneel down and say 'Deliver us from all evil for we do not presume to come etc.'. This repetition of the final petition in the Lord's Prayer is borrowed from the Sarum and Roman missals: but it does not fit the place in our 'Alternative Form'. The position differs greatly. In these Latin services the final petition is made as a response by the people. The priest in a low voice says the Amen and proceeds 'Libera nos etc....' an expansion of the petition and inaudible by the people. It is natural for the priest to say that petition for himself, which, as yet he has not spoken with his own mouth. But all that is foreign to our 'Alternative Form' - where the words 'Deliver us from all evil' are tacked on to 'the Pr. of humble access' - something quite different. It sounds like what it is - a patch. ¹

In the anaphora the word 'there' before 'by his one oblation' was omitted and the word 'made' was transferred to immediately before 'a full, perfect...'.² The reason for this alteration was probably that the insertion of the words 'to take our nature upon him' had already made the Eucharist a less narrow memorial of the passion alone and had made the word 'there' somewhat incongruous. The only other change was the restoration of the phrase 'to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving beseeching thee', following the usage of the Scottish and American rites. These words had been attached to the anamnesis of the Proposed Form of 1918³ when it had been fitted into the prayer of Oblation. In 1919 the anamnesis had been replaced by a new anamnesis, oblation, and invocation, and the 1662 phrase had disappeared with it.⁴ After 1919 the anaphora was not altered again, except in one important particular to be noted later.⁵ Since that date the order of the prayer in the South African rite has been;

- (1) the 1662 prayer of Consecration with a very few alterations,
- (2) the anamnesis, oblation, and invocation (including two clauses from the 1662 prayer of Oblation),
- (3) the rest of the prayer of Oblation.

The shortened form of administration was included in the 1920 edition of the rite.⁶ The rubric on second consecration was left unchanged.

1. Paper read to the Society of Sacred Study, diocese of St. John's. Cf. supra, p. 115

2. See Bazeley's suggestion, supra, p. 124

3. See appendix 2.

4. See appendix 3.

5. Cf. ANERA, pp. 166

6. Cf. supra, p. 65

The movement for revision in England was at this time rather behind what had been achieved in South Africa. In 1918 the archbishops had been requested to call a conference to discuss the deadlock reached in rearranging the canon.¹ A rough draft of the initial recommendations of the committee was sent to Frere in May 1919.² The final proposals from the conference were submitted to convocation on 11 February 1920.³ As the South African anaphora had been settled by the time of the session of Episcopal Synod on 17 February 1919 there can be no question of any direct dependence on the English revision of 1927/E. The only part of the anaphora to be revised in South Africa after 1919 was the invocation; and that bears no real resemblance to the corresponding part of the Communion Office of the Deposited Book. Most of the similarities between the English and the South African revisions are to be explained as resulting from a common parentage in the ideas and circumstances which shaped the two rites. There were some incidental borrowings - for example, the South African rubric on the use of the Decalogue was taken from the English revised book⁴ - but none of them affected the consecration prayer.

The preface to the South African revised edition of 1920 - Notes on the Revision of the Order for the Holy Communion - was reprinted exactly as it had stood in the 1919 edition⁵ but with the addition of one short new paragraph which explained why it was fitting that the Lord's Prayer should conclude the anaphora - 'for it gathers up, in the highest form, all that has been prayed for therein.'⁶

1. See Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p.62

2. Ibid., p.76, and for a general discussion of the English revision see Ollard, Crosse, and Bond - Dictionary of Eng. Church History, art. Common Prayer, Book of: II Revision in 20th Cent.

3. Jasper, op.cit., p.82.

4. Church Chronicle, Vol.XVII, p.155

5. See supra, p.102 ff

6. An Alternative Form etc. (Grocott & Sherry) 1920, p.6. The S.P.C.K. also published an undated 'altar' edition of the form but this did not include the bishops' preface.

In spite of the gathering strength of the opposition, then, the changes made in the Alternative Form after the Provincial Synod of 1919 were very slight, and did not in the least affect the rationale of the order as set out by the bishops in their preface. The reluctance of the Provincial Synod, the smallness of the majority in favour of the rite, the representations of the assessors, all failed to make the bishops materially alter the form of 1919. Probably the bishops were hoping to be able to have the form again approved in the next session of Provincial Synod in 1924. For this it was essential that there should be no 'material alteration'. After the excitement in the synod itself, the whole matter seems to have dropped out of public notice. It is extraordinary, for instance, that the official report of the proceedings of the Provincial Synod printed in the magazine of the diocese of Grahamstown, makes no mention of liturgical matters at all. The matter is made to appear all the more odd by the fact that Phelps himself, in the same issue of the magazine,¹ commented on the passage of the 1919 form through the synod.

The Revised Form received general assent. Further amendments have been made and it is to be printed and published as soon as possible. The Bishops passed a resolution² that the Revised Form is only to be used where the Minister and people agree in desiring it. When the form is finally issued application must be made to me first for its trial as an experiment and then, if desired, for more regular use.

Earlier in the year the bishop had authorised the use of the (unrevised) 1919 form on four successive Sundays (in the Cathedral these were August 10th and the next three Sundays) at the same time withdrawing the permission he had given for the use of the Proposed Form of 1918.³ Both these were now replaced by the guarded permission to use the 1920 form when it should have been published. It would appear that the

1. Grahamstown Newsletter, December 1919.
 2. i. e. in Episcopal Synod, cf. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, p. 9.
 3. Grahamstown Newsletter, July, 1919.

bishops were hoping to overcome the opposition to the new form by exercising a great deal of tact in regulating its use so that it might be preserved unaltered to become finally canonical in 1924.¹

It was soon made clear to the bishops that the dissidents were not to be appeased by the few small changes to the edition of 1920. As early as January 1920 the synod of the diocese of St John's resolved:

That this Synod is of the opinion that the Committee appointed by the Provincial Synod of 1919 for the revision of the 'Alternative Form for the Administration of the Holy Communion' as passed in Provincial Synod should publicly invite suggestions on their work of revision before its final presentation to the Provincial Synod.²

This resolution, dated 19 January 1920, was printed at the end of the cyclostyled copies of Canon Mason's paper to which reference has already been made,³ and was, no doubt, very largely influenced by it. Even though by the time that this resolution was passed the 1920 Form would not have been published, the bishop of the diocese who was president of the synod would have known what changes were proposed and could have informed the synod of them. The probability is that the diocesan synod was aware of the proposed changes for the 1920 edition and was still unsatisfied by them.

Dissatisfaction with the revised rite of 1920 was echoed even in the diocese of Grahamstown itself. Five priests working in East London, one of the largest towns in the diocese, sent a joint letter to the Church Chronicle deploring the invocation of 1919/20. One of the five was Bazeley's brother-in-law. This letter begins with the usual argument based on the rubric on supplementary consecration.

1. Cf. infra, p. 151

2. Because the greater part of the papers of the Liturgical Committee has disappeared it is impossible to tell how many suggestions from outside were, in fact, received by the Committee.

3. Supra, p. 115-126

Two particular pleas were made; first, that the invocation should be put in the 'normal' place (i.e. before the words of Institution) and secondly that the words 'upon these thy gifts that he may hallow this oblation' should be omitted.¹ Apparently the authors of this letter had not noticed the word 'creatures' or else were not offended at it.

Goold was quick to seize upon the absurdity of describing the place before the narrative of institution as the 'normal' place for the invocation.² Quoting Fortescue³, he insisted that the consecration prayer must be regarded as a whole and that the order mattered little since time has no place in man's worship of the eternal God. Bazeley, too, rushed to the defence of the 1920 form. His argument is chiefly a reiteration of his customary interpretation of the Dominical command 'do this'.⁴ Bazeley also argued that the Roman rite and 1662 were the only two Western rites without an invocation, that the invocation was 'normal' throughout the rest of Christendom, and that its 'normal' place was after the Institution. This statement obviously requires some qualification. Even 1662 contains a kind of invocation in 'Hear us, o merciful Father ..'⁵ and even the Roman canon is not altogether without any vestige of an invocation.⁶ There are also, on the other hand, some non-Roman Western masses in which the invocation

1. Church Chronicle Vol.XVII.p.211

2. ibid. p.231.

3. The Mass pp.347-352. In particular Goold must have been thinking of the passage (with its odd English) 'It is still right to conceive the Canon as one prayer. Consecration is the answer to that one prayer. It takes place no doubt at the words of institution but it is the effect of the whole prayer. There is no sequence of time with God.'(p.347)

4. Church Chronicle Vol.XVII.p.231 cf. Proposals p.2. and Theology Vol.II.p.161 and also W.C. Bishop in C.G.R. Vol.LXVI p.387.

5. cf. '...the existing epiclesis in the Prayer of Consecration"Hear us, o merciful Father, and Grant ..."etc. (Considerations on the petition to the Episcopal Synod etc.p.2.) and see also Gummey-The Consecration of the Eucharist pp.183ff.

6. see e.g. Dom Cabrol's opinion quoted in Atchley-The Epiclesis of the Eucharistic Liturgy and in the Consecration of the Fent.p.191.n. and cf. Duchesne - Christian Worship (5th Eng.Ed.)pp.177 & 181.

is hardly more developed than in the Roman or in 1662.¹ Nevertheless the five priests eventually withdrew 'normal' and substituted 'natural' for it.² This was the first skirmish in the great battle of the invocation. It is significant because the dissidents were priests working in the very diocese in which the movement for revision had started, and also because there came to the support of the dissidents the great opponent of the 1919/20 invocation, Dr John Darragh.

Darragh was a 'man of masterful quality; great driving power; broad humanity; impatient of restraint, yet withal a man who kept his spiritual life at a high level'.³ He was the first resident Anglican clergyman in the new mining town of Johannesburg and became rector of St Mary's Church there (now the Johannesburg Cathedral). It was there that his great work was done; but it was there also that he found himself, in the last years of the nineteenth century, at loggerheads with his bishop.⁴ He continued, however, to be rector of St Mary's until in 1908 'His strenuous life wore him out; "with a household of almost monastic bareness, he had given away every penny he possessed" and in 1908 "dear Darragh" with his kindly voice and big heart, retired on pension. He settled in Durban ..'⁵ He would seem to have been, then, a great pastor, a lovable man, and a theologian of some ability, (he was the author of The Resurrection of the Flesh - S.P.C.K. 1921) but also imperious by nature and a determined, tenacious, and infuriating disputant.

1. see e.g. the Mozarabic mass for Epiphany in Linton - Twenty-five Consecration Prayers pp.120.ff.

2. Church Chronicle Vol.XVII.p.268.

3. Page-The Harvest of Good Hope p.37

4. ibid. pp.57f.

5. Historical Records p.644.

Darragh's entry into the public debate about the invocation came at the point when the five East London priests had made their protest and Dean Hulme of Bloemfontein, in reply, had made his rather weak and muddled attempt to explain it away.¹ Darragh's argument² accords very largely with the normal 'Western' approach to the invocation of 1919. He argues that the West, including the Anglican Church, makes the words of Institution consecratory, while the East recites them historically and without ceremonial acts, making the epiclesis the form of consecration. Darragh's reason for classing the Anglican practice so definitely with that of the Roman West rests simply upon the 1662 rubrics attaching the manual acts to the words of Institution. This argument is considered in detail later³ and is not entirely satisfactory since the 1662 manual acts are patient of quite another interpretation.⁴ But they were to become the backbone of all Darragh's arguments against the invocation of 1919. In this, his first public objection to it Darragh asserted that, in the absence of certain knowledge as to the form of words used by our Lord himself in consecrating the first Eucharist, both Eastern and Western forms ought to be pronounced valid. But Gould was, in Darragh's view, trying to impose upon the Province some third form of consecration, neither Eastern nor Western.⁵ '... in every living liturgy with an Epiclesis it neither precedes nor follows the Form of Consecration. It is the Form of Consecration.'⁶ At this point in the argument the public debate was forcibly stopped by the editor of the Chronicle who refused to publish any more letters on the subject for a period of six months. In fact, until the

1. supra p. 118 f.

2. Church Chronicle Vol. XVII. p. 268.

3. infra p. 144 ff.

4. cf. e.g. Gummey op.cit. p. 184, n.

5. Church Chronicle Vol. XVII. p. 301.

6. ibid. p. 340.

publication of the Natal petition, for which this debate was only a preliminary trial of strength, liturgical affairs remained rather quieter. This preliminary, however, is important because it gives a foretaste of Darragh's stock argument, polished and bolstered up with a good deal of scholarship in the later bouts, which ran like this; East or West - choose one or the other. Either will do for they have agreed to differ. But there must and can not be any third type.

1921 was the year of crisis. Darragh organised the clergy of the diocese of Natal into petitioning Episcopal Synod against the invocation of the 1920 form. The Synod met in Johannesburg in January 1921. It was the first meeting of the bishops since they had issued the revised form of 1920, almost immediately after the session of Provincial Synod in November 1919 - and it was the first opportunity the dissidents had had for voicing an official protest, since the meeting of the assessors. That Darragh was really responsible for the petition cannot be doubted. On 5 January 1921 he wrote to Frere, 'I enclose our petition and the pamphlet in justification of the Petition which the Committee asked me, as a person fairly conversant with liturgical literature, to draw up. The Committee adopted my draft with a few immaterial amendments. Unfortunately the work had to be done against time as a meeting of Episcopal Synod was imminent.'¹ The petition itself, though printed, is undated and bears no printers' name. It has been possible to trace only three copies of it still extant. One is in the minutes of Episcopal Synod. One is amongst Bishop Frere's papers at Mirfield. The third was found amongst the books and papers of Canon Gould. All these copies include the explanatory pamphlet referred to by Darragh in his letter to Frere quoted above. The bare

1. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p.212.

text of the petition, without the explanatory notes, was published in the Church Chronicle.¹ The date of the framing of the petition is fixed by the reference in Darragh's letter quoted above to the 'meeting of Episcopal Synod' being 'imminent'. Synod met in January 1921, so the work on the petition must have been done in the last weeks of 1920. The copy of the petition inserted into the minutes of the Synod is opposite the page dated 10 January 1921.

The petition seems to have been the outcome of official diocesan business. The accompanying^{ing} explanatory pamphlet, entitled Considerations bearing on the Petition to the Episcopal Synod, addressed to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Natal, is in the form of an open letter ~~addressed~~ to Dr Baines. It is signed, like the petition itself, by nine clergymen of the diocese, including Darragh himself, W.T. Alston,² and Canon M.C. Hodson.³ After signatures appears a note:

The Committee constituted subsequently to the discussion on this subject at the recent Clergy Conference in Maritzburg, to carry out your Lordship's advice to the Conference.

Presumably the bishop had advised the clergy of the diocese to make their dissatisfaction known by means of a formal petition to the Synod.⁴ The petition as printed in the Church Chronicle has, after the nine signatures, the words 'and the European Clergy with few exceptions.' The same addition has been made in manuscript to the copy of the petition found amongst Gould's papers.

The petition is short and to the point. It requests the bishops of the Province:

(1) to reconsider the wording of both Invocations

1. Vol. XVIII, p. 7.

2. See supra, p. 76

3. See supra, p. 117 & infra, p. 156

4. And perhaps Baines was himself none too happy about the revised rite. See pp. 16-104 supra + 198 infra

in the Alternative Form ... and especially to clear up the ambiguity of the new Invocation...
 (2) to emphasise the tentative and experimental nature of the latest edition of that Form. (i.e. 1920)
 (3) to bear in mind the desirability of carrying the clergy with them ...
 (4) and to weigh its effects upon the cohesion of the English Church.¹

The Considerations attached to the petition is a lengthy and closely argued pamphlet dealing almost entirely with the first of these four points alone. The first part of the pamphlet, though it opens with protestations of gratitude for the Alternative Form, is really concerned to state the differences between Eastern and Western Christianity in theology of consecration. No evidence is alleged at this point² to show that the East and West do, in fact, adopt the rigid and unyielding attitude attributed to them by Darragh, but he does later, in a note appended to the body of the pamphlet, list the evidence for the 'Western use of the words of Institution as the Form of Consecration'.³ In this note Darragh cites Ambrose, De Mysteriis, 54., Tertullian, Adv. Marcion, IV, 40 (doubtful), and De Sacramentis. He quotes the last of these from Fortescue's The Mass⁴ and goes on to say, 'The best brief summing up of the extant evidence for the Eastern Epiiclesis is in Father Fortescue's The Mass, pp. 402 - 3.' There follows a long extract from Fortescue beginning, 'The Invocation of the Holy Ghost is not primitive.' Finally Darragh refers to Gelasius I, Optatus, and Isidore, all of whom, he says, 'speak of the Holy Spirit as the agent in consecration' but give 'no indication as to whether the agency of the Holy Spirit was expressed verbally in the Office used'.⁵ Frere was later to accuse Darragh of giving a misleading impression by his handling of these three Western writers, for Frere maintained that Darragh gave a false,

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, p. 7.

2. Considerations, pp. 2f.

3. Ibid., p. 16

4. Fortescue, op. cit., pp. 128f.

5. Considerations, p. 16.

a deliberately false, evaluation of the evidence for a Western invocation. He had referred to one of two relevant passages from Gelasius, and had ignored the more explicit of the two.¹ He had failed to give the context of Isidore's reference to the Holy Spirit - the passage, that is, in which Isidore deals with the post-pridie prayer - a context which probably means that Isidore was, in fact, thinking of a formal invocation of the Holy Spirit.²

The whole of this argument on the Western form of consecration, Darragh placed in a brief appendage to the pamphlet. In the body of the pamphlet he assumed that there was a fixed and unquestionable 'Western tradition' to which the South African Form adhered. Inevitably Darragh cited the 'third rubric' as the evidence for assigning the Alternative Form to the Western tradition. Undoubtedly this rubric was a weak point in the new rite. Frere himself had criticised it and all that the bishops could say in its defence was, 'Play is made with the rubric about supplementary consecration - rather for embarrassment - for clearly it is open for us to claim that the short formula is intended to be covered by the whole Prayer of Consecration.....But to claim that a scarcely necessary rubric aimed at an accidental occurrence is to govern the whole scheme of Consecration is monstrous.'³ Darragh's interpretation of the rubric has, however, a long and respectable Anglican ancestry,⁴ and it was inconsistent for the bishops to have added the old 1662 invocation to the form for supplementary consecration and not to have added the new invocation which they had especially imported into the rite.

1. Both passages from Gelasius were quoted in Fortescue - The Mass, p.405, so Darragh must have known them. Darragh quotes from Thiel - Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum, i, p.542 (but cf. ibid., i.486 which he does not quote.) For Darragh's argument see Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p.221.n.

2. Jasper, op.cit., p.221.

3. Ibid., p.214.

4. See e.g. views quoted in Simpson - The Prayer of Consecration, pp. 98f.

If they were going to argue that the 'third rubric' did not in any way define the 'form of consecration' but was covered by the whole of the anaphora, then it would have been sufficient to have used the form for supplementary consecration provided in 1662. There was no need to add the 1662 invocation to the form. For it cannot be argued that the bishops were simply continuing to use the old form of 1662. In the Proposed Form of 1918 they had done just that, and the 1662 rubric was printed exactly as it had been.¹ But in 1919, in the first Alternative Form, the bishops deliberately changed the rubric. First, they made it obligatory to reconsecrate² in both kinds. Secondly, they added the first invocation to the words to be used. It cannot be said that what they did was an accident, or due to a slip of the proof-reader's eye. They intentionally changed the 1662 form for supplementary consecration, adding to it the first (the 1662) invocation, but not the second, new one, and in doing so they cut the ground from under their own feet. Even more extraordinary than the bishops' inconsistency in this matter, is the fact that no one seems to have noticed that it was inconsistent. Of all the people who criticised the new rubric, not one remarked that it was odd to use the old invocation and yet not use the new one. Presumably those who criticised the new form from the Western point of view ignored the inconsistency because they wished to insist that the words of Institution alone were consecratory, for their argument was equally inconsistent. When Darragh sought to prove by reference to the 'third rubric' that the words of Institution were the only essential form of consecration, what he was really proving was that the invocation 'Hear us, O merciful Father' was similarly indispensable.

1. See SUPRA, p. 109

2. Strictly speaking, of course, there can be no question of 'reconsecration', since this is not a matter of repeating the form over elements that had already been consecrated. But the word is convenient, and was often used in the documents of the time, and the more correct alternative is sometimes too clumsy to use.

Having attempted thus to prove that the Alternative Form belonged firmly in the Western tradition, Darragh next turned to his task of dealing with the invocation. 'Our objection is not to an epiclesis as such, for no known liturgy is without an epiclesis of some sort...' but the 'second epiclesis ... ignores and obscures the existing epiclesis in the Prayer of Consecration.' With complete irrelevance Darragh devotes a part of his pamphlet to proving that 'invocation of the Holy Spirit' does not mean 'invocation addressed to the Holy Spirit'.¹ As this point was never at issue in the whole of the controversy, it can safely be ignored here. Returning to the main theme of his argument Darragh points out that the Scottish and American rites have dropped the 'first epiclesis' and that its retention in the South African form is one of the causes of the obscurity and illogicality of the new anaphora.² Obviously it would be nonsense to have two formal invocations of the Holy Spirit in the course of one anaphora,³ but the South African prayer has not done that. If Darragh meant that the prayer has 'two epicleses' in the sense that it has two prayers asking the Father for some special gift, then that is obviously true - but one can see little harm in that. As Darragh's favourite, Fortescue⁴ has said, invocations are to be found 'scattered throughout various liturgies both within and often before the Consecration prayer.'⁵

1. Considerations, pp. 2f. & 16.

2. A similar point against the South African rite has lately been made by the present Dean of George (see infra, p. 185) who has elegantly said that because it 'has two epicleses' the rite has a pronounced 'smell of the 1920's'.

3. Cf. 'It is hardly possible to pray twice formally for the same crucial descent of the Holy Spirit.' (Lietzmann - Mass and Lord's Supper (Eng. Trans.), p. 62.)

4. Fortescue is quoted altogether about half-a-dozen times in the pamphlet. Darragh later excused his frequent use of him by saying 'The local apologists for the "Alternative Form" kept on saying, "Oh, you have only to read Fortescue and you will be convinced that it is all right."' (Jasper-Walter Howard Frere, p. 225.)

5. Fortescue - The Mass, p. 404.

It is possible to detect, as Lietzmann has detected, a large number of such invocations in the Roman rite. Lietzmann argued that Te igitur is 'of the well-known type of those Gallican epicleses in which the petition for the acceptance of the offering is connected with the blessing of it... having originally the character of an offertory.'¹ that Hanc igitur is 'an ancient offertory prayer and has its parallels in Gallican and Mozarabic epicleses;² that Quam oblationem is an epiclesis of the type 'in which the blessing of the gifts is sought first, the petition for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the gifts occurring in the second place.'³ and that Supplices te possesses 'the normal termination of the epiclesis in East and West.'⁴

Cirlot has also argued that the early Church probably used the term 'epiclesis' to describe the whole prayer of consecration.⁵ If he is correct in this, then the more particular invocations within the prayer may fairly be considered as summing up the intention of the whole prayer at various intervals. Though it may be untidy to sum up in this way twice in the course of the prayer, it can hardly be condemned as wrong, and it will become apparent later that the South African bishops were, indeed, concerned with the meaning of the whole prayer, and not with any one part of it.⁶ The real weakness in the bishops' case at this point was that they had laid so much stress on the great gains in logicity in the new rite and in the anaphora in particular. They claimed, for instance, that the new arrangement made 'the service very much easier of explanation to Confirmation Candidates and others preparing for Communion.'⁷ Once they had made such large claims, it was easy to criticise them. In the cause

1. Lietzmann - Mass and Lord's Supper, (Eng. Tr.), p. 96.

2. Ibid. p. 97.

3. Ibid., p. 97 and cf. p. 79.

4. Ibid., p. 98.

5. Cirlot - The Early Eucharist, p. 194.

6. See infra, pp. 150f.

7. An Alternative Form etc. (1919), p. 2.

of logic and simplicity they might have been better advised to omit the 'first epiclesis' and concentrate upon the second; but they can hardly be said to be wrong for having left it in. No doubt their chief reason for doing so was to retain as much as possible of 1662 intact.

Darragh's next point in Considerations was a classification of eucharistic epicleses into three types. The first type is that of the Eastern liturgies. There is nothing to be said about this part of the pamphlet save that it ought to be pointed out that the very passage which Darragh quotes to establish that the Eastern theology of consecration makes the epiclesis the form and moment of consecration, itself considerably modifies the rigidity which he attributes to it.

... it will be seen [says Darragh's source] that the Words of the Saviour which the Minister utters as he points to the sacred gifts, and the calling for the Holy Ghost over the gifts, constitute a single, undivided continuous act.¹

There really is nothing in this quotation to support the division of East and West into two irreconcilable schools of thought each affirming a quite different 'moment of consecration', who have yet somehow 'agreed to differ'. No doubt the East and West do differ. No doubt the East does consider the invocation as the supreme moment of the consecration. But this quotation shows that the Eastern concentration upon the invocation is not one which excludes the narrative of the institution from the 'form of consecration'.

Darragh's second type of invocation is the Western one "which precedes the consecration". The South African form, he says, is manifestly different from this type, 'if only by reason of its position'.

The third type of invocation is dismissed in a few words.

In fragments of some Western Liturgies an epiclesis is sometimes found after the Consecration Prayer, appealing

1. Abp. Macarius of Lithuania - Dogmatic Theology (Sacramental Section), pp. 110f.

to the Father to accept the consecrated elements as a valid Eucharist, and to make it available for the communicants. ¹

The South African invocation, the pamphlet argues, is not of the Eastern type because the 'third rubric' defines the words of Institution as essential for consecration. If the invocation is not itself to be regarded as consecratory, so Darragh's argument runs, then it cannot be of the Eastern type and must, therefore, be one of the Western varieties. But as a Western invocation it is unsatisfactory, because it throws doubt on the validity of the consecration which, in his view, has already been effected by the words of Institution. Darragh argues that to use the word 'creatures' in the two invocations is to suggest that the elements are in the same state after the narrative as before it. Instead of drawing the obvious conclusion - that the bishops might have done this deliberately so as to destroy any possibility of a particular part of the prayer being regarded as alone effective - Darragh continues to hold to the narrowly Roman view on which, indeed, the whole argument of the pamphlet depends. In this view the invocation must be near blasphemy.

To reduce the suggestion of blasphemy and to strengthen the 'Western' interpretation of the prayer Darragh desired that the first invocation should be amended and rendered less ambiguous. He suggests that 'Hear us, etc.' should be recast in the form used in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 or in 'Bishop Gore's 'A Prayer Book Revised' (pp. 80 - 81)".

Strictly speaking A Prayer Book Revised was not 'Bishop Gore's', though the bishop contributed a foreword to it. It was an anonymous work; but a letter found among Canon Gould's papers helps to explain its authorship and the form of invocation used in it.

1. But cf. W.C. Bishop on 'legitima eucharistia' in The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites, p. 50.

Dear Mr Gould,

Thankyou very much for sending me the pamphlet on the liturgy. It is most useful and full of good stuff.

[This must refer to Proposals, for the letter is dated 24 January 1914, and a further paragraph follows on the same subject. Then the letter continues.]

By the way, I am the author of 'A Prayer Book Revised', and I quite agree with what you say about the Epiklesis. The form used was preferred by the Bishop, mainly as not involving too violent a change, and by Brightman, on the ground that it offered a reconciliation between East and West. Brightman takes the view that both Roman and Eastern have a right to their own views, and that we ought not to take sides. But I agree that the Epiklesis had better be in the right place.

If you ever publish a second edition, you can say that the Editor of 'A Prayer Book Revised' is quite willing for the Epiklesis to be placed where you have placed it.

The letter is signed by Percy Dearmer. Gould had mentioned A Prayer Book Revised in the third of his appendices to Proposals; he had given his reasons for preferring not to adopt the kind of invocation that Dearmer had proposed in that book. Dearmer's remarks are a reply to Gould's criticisms. There is no way of telling whether Gould ever used this letter from Dearmer to answer Darragh's argument. Certainly there was never a second edition of Proposals.

Returning again to the argument of Considerations, Darragh's next concern is to show that the South African invocation is based on that of the Scottish rite. In fact the similarity is limited to the words 'thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts' which appear in both rites. Darragh's case that the one depends on the other is a very difficult one to maintain. The South African invocation was really a composite thing, drawn from many sources, and, at least partly, suggested by Frere.¹ But Darragh is determined to see the South African invocation as a derivative of the Scottish; and the Scottish, itself, as a thing of little worth. He devotes three pages of the pamphlet and a long additional note to invective which heaps scorn upon the form, history,

1. See supra, pp. 95

and parentage of the Scottish liturgy. There really is no other way to describe this extraordinary and gratuitous polemic. The last paragraph of Darragh's additional note is typical.

Thus we can see that the central and vital part of the Alternative Form is modelled on a Rite, which itself is derived from the moribund Communion Office of a small English Sect, now extinct. [i.e. the Non-Jurors] That Office is neither Eastern, nor Western, nor Gallican, nor Laudian, but is frankly, in its strength and its weakness, a characteristic product of the eighteenth century. It is with extreme reluctance that the damaging facts regarding the source of the second Epiclesis in the Alternative Form are here set forth. It is no pleasure to spy out the nakedness of the land. But when certain features of the Scottish Liturgy are offered as sufficient justification for liturgical eccentricities, it is necessary to enquire carefully into its origins.¹

These derogatory exclamations drew down upon Darragh the wrath of many Scottish clergymen. One of these was A.P.F. Erskine who had earlier condemned the South African anaphora as 'to say the least, a most lamentable bathos, this false grafting of East upon West: coming after the true grafting of the Scottish Office.'² Erskine continued to sympathise with the framers of the Natal petition but he now, nevertheless, strongly resented and attempted to rebut the criticisms that Considerations levelled at the Scottish liturgy.³ The dean of St Andrew's, with a slower and more stately wrath, also rebuked Darragh for his rudeness.⁴

A comparison of the two invocations, the Scottish and the South African, shows quite plainly that there is no evidence upon which Darragh could base his claim that the South African form was virtually derived from the Scottish. And, in fact, in the face of Scottish anger, Darragh had to withdraw all his calumnies on the Scottish rite, his criticisms of the learning of the Scottish bishops, and his attempt to derive the South African invocation from the Scottish. He contented himself with falling back on the safer, if unoriginal, argument that Erskine had already used; namely that

1. Considerations, p.19.

2. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVII, p.268.

3. Ibid., Vol. XVIII, p.39.

4. Ibid., p.94.

the Scottish liturgy was a true, the South African a false, graft of East upon West.¹ This was a very different thing from his original contention that the South African invocation was bad because the Scottish was worse. The argument from the Scottish rite of 1912 stood revealed as an unsavoury red herring.

A great part of the Considerations² is devoted to an attempt to use the manual acts of 1662 as a way of interpreting the theology of consecration inherent in the prayer itself. It was Darragh's contention that the Easterns attached no ceremonial to the recital of the words of Institution, whereas the Epiklesis was treated ceremonially as the moment of great importance. The last part of this statement is true, of course, and may be admitted without further argument. But Darragh proceeded to claim that the manual acts, taken over into the South African rite of 1919 from the Book of 1662, mark the words of Institution as the moment of consecration since they attach the only ceremonial laid down by rubric to that part of the prayer. It is obvious that no ceremonial is, by rubric, attached to the invocation of the 1919 rite. The invocation is also, as Darragh contended, very much less definitely worded than the Eastern type.³ But is it true that the manual acts of 1662, still attached by rubric to the words of Institution in the South African rite, are ceremonial evidence that these words alone are to be regarded as consecratory? Even the Eastern liturgies are not completely without 'manual acts' at this point. In the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom these acts are performed by the deacon and not by the priest; but the deacon performs the same acts again at the invocation.⁴ In S. James the priest is instructed to 'take' at the narrative of the institution, just as he is

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, pp. 94 & 122

2. Considerations, pp. 7f. & 10-12.

3. Darragh gives an English translation of the invocation of S. Chrysostom without citing a source - but see Brightman - Liturgies Eastern & Western, Vol. I, pp. 386f.

4. See e.g. Brightman, loc. cit.

in the Anglican rites.¹ The Roman rite has only two manual acts at the words of Institution - 'taking' and 'signing with the cross'. The only manual act that 1662 shares with the Roman rite (which Darragh used as the norm for the 'Western tradition') is one which it also shares with the Eastern liturgy of S. James. The real ceremonial difference between the East and Rome is that the signing of the elements and the prostration before them comes, in the one case at the invocation, in the other, at the words of Institution. Neither prostration nor signing is enjoined by the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. The direction to 'take' in the Book of 1662 was probably one of the features which that book inherited from the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, and it is likely that the ancestry of the Scottish book is to be traced through the Scottish bishops of the time to the Book of Common Order, John Knox, and Calvin, rather than through Laud and the Prayer Book of 1549, to the medieval Latin rites.² There is not much ground for the belief that the rubric which directs the priest to 'take' (the only act 1662 shares with the Roman rite) was put into the B.C.P. to enshrine the Roman theory of consecration. Certainly it is true that at least one of the manual acts of 1662, the direction to 'break', was introduced as a result of the representations made by the puritans at the Savoy Conference.³ It is not clear where the direction 'to lay hands upon' came from, but it was not the Roman rite. All in all, it is not easy to prove that the revisers of 1661 intended the manual acts to indicate that the words of Institution, and these words alone, constituted the 'form of consecration'; to argue from ceremonial, some of which is not fixed by rubric but is simply traditional,

1. Brightman, - Liturgies Eastern & Western, pp. 51f. & Gummey - The Consecration of the Eucharist, pp. 70f.

2. Donaldson - The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, p. 13 & pp. 68ff.

3. Parker - Introduction to the Revisions of the B.C.P., p. lxxvii, & Cardwell's Conferences, (3rd. Ed.), p. 321.

seems highly unsatisfactory.

Darragh also argued that the Americans, whose rite contains an invocation after the words of Institution, 'genuflect and elevate at the Words of Institution (vide Dr. Dearmer's Art of Public Worship, p.105.n.) shewing that they regard the Consecration as already effected ... ¹ Dearmer's note, in fact, reads, 'It is quite surprising, for instance, in America, to find priests who genuflect and elevate at the Words of Institution, as if there were no other theory of Consecration than the Roman, and the plain words of the American anaphora had no meaning whatever.'² Dr Gummey's Consecration of the Eucharist, already several times referred to, is an American work devoted to showing that the invocation is the 'form of consecration' in the American rite, so it is clear that there are some Americans, at least, who do not fall within Darragh's judgement that 'in practice ... they take the Invocation in something of a Gallican sense.'³

Two other points from the Considerations need to be particularly noted. First Darragh argued that the timelessness of eternity is no excuse for illogicality in the arrangement of a rite. There were those who argued that consecration was a timeless act and that the order of the parts of the anaphora was not important.⁴ Darragh rightly retorted that, if that were so, and the order of the parts did not matter, 'what becomes of the talk of "dislocation" in our

1. Considerations, p.12.

2. Dearmer - Art of Public Worship, loc.cit.; the practice of the revisers of the South African rite and of other clergymen closely associated with them, was to genuflect once at the end of the narrative of the institution, once after the invocation, and once at the end of the prayer. At least one South African bishop at the present time (1957) neither elevates nor genuflects at the institution, but genuflects after the invocation. Most South African priests, however, probably elevate and genuflect as directed in the Roman missal.

3. Considerations, p.12.

4. Cf. Gould's use of Fortescue in this connection, supra, p. This must have been one of the cases Darragh referred to when justifying his 'large' use of Fortescue. (See supra, p.138.n.). Frere had said, 'The only original part of Fortescue is his mistakes.', a dictum he must have enjoyed since he repeated it. See Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, pp. 218, 220, & 225.

Prayer Book Service, and the claim that revision is for the purpose of remedying that dislocation?¹ But Darragh entirely ignores the fact that the placing of the invocation after the words of Institution has a logic of its own since the place of the invocation is probably fixed by the idea of Pentecost at the end of the anamnesis.² The other point to be noted is that Darragh argues that the Gallican anaphoras afford no precedent for the South African rite, since they are variable. Obviously, Darragh argues, what is an essential part of the prayer could not be virtually omitted on one day and be included on another. This argument has a convincing ring, and no doubt it carried conviction to many who were doubtful about the revised rite. Its validity depends entirely, however, upon the view Darragh takes of the history of the Gallican masses. It is true that some of the later non-Roman Western masses have invocations so vague as sometimes hardly to be invocations at all,³ but one might well prefer to hold, with W.C. Bishop, 'that the invocation [in these cases] has been whittled away and finally discarded under the influence of a doctrinal prepossession.'⁴

For a convenient summary of the argument of the pamphlet it may be as well to give a series of quotations from Darragh's own summing up.

To sum up - if it is desired to discard the Western method of consecration and adopt the Eastern usage, let us have the real thing. Sweep away from the Words of Institution the traditional ceremonial [i.e. the manual acts] of the West, and let them be recited historically, as they are in Eastern Liturgies, and then let the Consecration follow, using the genuine Epiclesis of the East in its ancient Form. If we are not prepared to do that, let us cease to talk of following the Eastern Tradition

Again if we wish to add to our existing epiclesis - 'Hear us, o merciful Father' - a post-consecration epiclesis after the manner of some Gallican Masses, a genuine one would surely be better than a modern imitation

1. Considerations, p. 12, cf. Proposed Form (1918), p. 3.

2. Though Pentecost is not actually mentioned in the South African anaphora.

3. See the example of a Gallican post-secretum in West - Western Liturgies, p. 51.

4. Bishop in C. Q. R., Vol. LXVI, p. 395.

But we would venture to submit that the revival amongst us of features taken from Liturgies long extinct, should be done with extreme caution.

The Home Church has had the Revision of the Prayer Book in hand for a dozen years, with the advantage of a scholarship to which we in this Province cannot pretend, including that of the eminent liturgiologists Brightman, Frere and W.C. Bishop. It is surely worthy of note that they have left the Consecration Prayer untouched, except that the Prayer of Oblation is to be used immediately after it ...¹

It is interesting to note that when Bishop heard what Darragh had said about him he wrote to Gould,

My most fixed idea is that the invocation should come after the narrative of the institution, and if the idea has gone forth that I am in favour of the invocation coming before the institution, I should be obliged to you to contradict it as widely as possible.²

Frere's view as to the position of the invocation agreed, of course, with that of Bishop, and he made it clear to Darragh that it did so.³ Brightman, alone, might be thought to be more sympathetic to Darragh's argument. When bishop Nash wrote to solicit Frere's help against Darragh's criticisms of the 1920 Form he said, 'Darragh has written to F.E. Brightman and got him to curse us. But the same F.E.E. said to me - for I sent him a copy - "It's all right". But he seems to have been impressed by the Supplementary Consecration argument.'⁴ Unfortunately neither Brightman's 'curse' nor his earlier, rather grudging approval, have survived. There is reason to suppose that Brightman's earlier views were not so critical of the sort of invocation that was included in the Alternative Form of 1919/1920.⁵ It is equally clear that his views did later harden against such an invocation - and perhaps Darragh's argument was partly responsible, as Nash suggested - for by 1927 Brightman was writing,

there is no real contrast between prayer [i.e. invocation] and the recital [of the narrative of institution] since

1. Considerations, pp. 12ff.

2. Gould quoting a private letter from Bishop in Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, p. 215.

3. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p. 220

4. Ibid., p. 215.

5. See Dearmer's letter to Gould of 24 January 1914. Supra, p. 142

the recital is a part of a continuous prayer and is itself explicitly addressed to the Eternal Father And indeed the recital might be said to represent a higher type of prayer than a petition for the coming of the Holy Ghost, since it simply, so to speak, lays the situation before God for Him to do what He will. ¹

In the same article Brightman described the invocation of the proposed English rite of 1927 as being by its position 'a gratuitous departure from our tradition'. He also wrote,

This Invocation of 1549 ... is Western in its whole substance ... the order of 1549 is, to say the least of it, wholly defensible, and gives us all we need desire without any departure from Western precedent. ²

Brightman makes no reference to the invocation of the South African rite in this particular article, and we have no direct means of knowing what his reaction to it was, in so many words, but these extracts make it clear that his general attitude was no longer that the invocation should come before the words of Institution because 'we ought not to take sides,'³ but because we ought very definitely to take the 'Western' side. Brightman did, in the course of the article quoted above, refer to the South African anaphora in order to criticise its inclusion of the Lord's Prayer under the general heading of THE CONSECRATION. Otherwise he did not mention it; no doubt because by that time the South African invocation had been emasculated and there was no need for comment.

To return to Darragh's Considerations; it is clear that his argument depends upon two fundamental assumptions: first, that both Eastern and Western theories of consecration are 'of ecumenical allowance' and 'are catholic', but that there is no other possible 'catholic' theory;⁴ and secondly that the manual acts and the 'third rubric' prove that the South African rite embodies the 'Western' theory.⁵ The bishops

1. Brightman in a pamphlet entitled The Alternative Canon (O.U.P. 1927), p. 5. also published in C.C.R. (July 1927) Vol. CIV, pp. 219ff. under the title The New Prayer Book Examined.

2. Ibid., pp. 10f.

3. Cf. Dearmer to Gould, supra, p. 142

4. Considerations, p. 2.

5. Ibid., pp. 1 & 7f.

who had framed the rite, did not want to specify any 'moment of consecration'. Nash, a member of the Liturgical Committee, wrote to Frere in these terms about the notorious rubric; 'clearly it is open for us to claim that the short formula allowed is intended to be covered by the whole prayer of consecration'.¹ The bishops as a whole confirmed this later, saying;

'...they [i.e. the bishops] hold to the primitive view ... that when thanksgiving has been offered in prayerful trust that God's Power will accomplish his purpose, we then can securely believe in the Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist, without debating the exact moment when the Presence was granted. This applies to the Canon equally in the B.C.P. and in the Alternative Form. We are not tied to the belief that in the B.C.P. the narrative is the moment, any more than that in the Alternative Form the Epiclesis is the moment.'²

This surely suggests that the revisers intended the whole prayer, and not any specific part of it, to be consecratory. There was a fundamental disagreement between them and Darragh as to what views were 'of ecumenical allowance'. Darragh was not prepared to countenance any view except the rigid Eastern or rigid Western. The bishops were caught in the tangle of their own making. They had been careless in the framing of the rubric on supplementary consecration. That they failed to include the new invocation in the form to be used particularly when they were at pains to include, quite deliberately and definitely, the old invocation from 1662, must seem an inexplicable, and almost incredible, piece of muddle and folly. To be consistent they ought really to have specified that the whole prayer was to be used again or at least the greater part of it. The omission of the new invocation, when the old was included in the form, suggested that the new invocation was not regarded as at all consecratory.

1. Jasper-Walter Howard Frere p.214

2. Report of Liturgical Committee to Episcopal Synod Nov.1921.

It appears from the minutes that when Episcopal Synod met on 10 January 1921, Phelps reported that the Liturgical Committee had not met since the last session of the Synod in October and November 1919, when the assessors' suggestions had been considered.¹ Apparently Episcopal Synod received the Natal petition, for a copy was inserted in the minutes. The Liturgical Committee was re-appointed to consider the whole question of the revised form, and to report back to the Synod on any further alterations it thought desirable to make 'before the Form is finally passed by the next Provincial Synod.' The phrase quoted directly from the resolution of the Synod is deceptive. If no changes had been made, and if Provincial Synod had agreed to pass the 1919/20 form again, that would have given it final effect. But as the Liturgical Committee materially altered the form of 1920, it needed to be passed twice more, by consecutive sessions of Provincial Synod.² No doubt the language of the resolution reflected the desire of the bishops to have the matter finally settled with as little further unrest as possible.

Episcopal Synod issued an official report of its proceedings in which this resolution was given in full.³ The announcement that the bishops had returned the Alternative Form to the Liturgical Committee did nothing to quieten the alarm felt in a great many parts of the country at the course revision was taking. The Natal petition provoked a great deal of argument and discussion - most of it aired in the columns of the Chronicle. In particular the signatories of the petition found themselves involved in two serious and important controversies by correspondence.

1. supra p. 125

2. supra p. III

3. Church Chronicle Vol. XVIII, p. 24.

Bishop Nash, member of the Community of the Resurrection¹ and co-adjutor bishop of Cape Town, was at the time one of the leading members of the Liturgical Committee. Early in 1921, under the stress of the controversy about the invocation, he emerged as the great champion of the 1919 rite. Soon after the close of the 1921 session of the Episcopal Synod Nash wrote to Frere asking for his assistance in controverting Darragh. 'The motive,' he wrote, 'is really I think dislike of any movement away from the Roman tradition.'²

The main attack, however, is on the formula of the Invocation. No doubt the petitioners want to tie us down to what we have desired to avoid, i.e. the statement of the moment, and the exact words which consecrate.

Darragh also wrote, twice, to Frere. The first letter was written on 5 January 1921, even before Episcopal Synod had met, and the second on 18 February.³ Frere was apparently in Canada at this time and answered none of the letters until his return in July.⁴ All these letters are printed in full in Jasper's Walter Howard Frere⁵ and need not be dealt with in detail again here. Darragh's first letter is simply a covering letter enclosing a copy of the petition and the Considerations. His second letter is chiefly concerned with maintaining that since the fourth century the Church as a whole has been agreed about three things;

1. The Canon of Scripture
2. The Constantinopolitan Creed
3. The Consecration of the Eucharist in either of two ways.

Of these three accepted things the last is the least subjected to controversy until recent times, and, as far as literary records go, not at all from the fourth to the sixteenth century.⁵

1. Frere was at that time superior of the Community.

2. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p.214.

3. Ibid., pp. 212ff. 4. Ibid., p.214.

5. Ibid., p.213. On 'literary records' cf. Darragh in Considerations, p.2.; 'The only approach to formal questioning of the validity of the Eastern rite by the Western Church occurred at the Council of Florence of unhappy memory (1438-9) but it was not mentioned in the concordat ultimately reached The Pope refused to have the speeches entered on the official minutes.' (The emphasis on certain phrases is mine).

To this letter Frere replied in some astonishment; and he wrote, too, to bishop Nash reiterating his complaint against the 'third rubric', the source of so much of the trouble.¹ Frere was indignant about some of the points raised by Darragh and about Darragh's method of argument. The lameness of Darragh's reply to Frere's criticisms² shows quite clearly that, however unconvinced Darragh may have been, Frere had really won the argument. Darragh tried to maintain his fundamental point that the East and West had agreed to differ. One of the grounds of argument advanced to support this point was that 'Rome allows both methods [of consecration] within her jurisdiction.'³ But this is not really true. Rome allows both rites; but attaches certain conditions to the use of the Eastern rite. Frere, for instance, wrote, at a much later date than this controversy,

The Uniat Leitougikon was arranged on the lines of a Latin Missale; in the middle were set out the three Anaphoras of St Chrysostom, St Basil and the Presanctified in Greek: the Dominical Words were displayed in large type, and surrounded by rubrics⁴ which expressly call them Words of Consecration, and prescribe the Elevation. After them the Anamnesis follows and the Invocation in the usual form.....

Rome, then, allows the rite, but changes the import of parts of it, though the invocation is allowed to follow the (consecratory) words of Institution without any suggestion of blasphemy. It is true that Mr Edmund Bishop has said,

Each of these great bodies of Christians [i.e. Easterns and Romans] regards the Mass of the other as equally valid, or at least equally operative, for the purpose of effecting the change. [i.e. of the elements.]⁵

But Bishop gives no authority for this statement and, in any case, to say that Rome regards the Eastern rite as 'operative' is not to say that she regards the Eastern invocation as the operative part of it. Darragh, in fact, appears to

1. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p.217 cf. C.O.R., Vol.KC, p.371.

2. Ibid., pp.221ff.

3. Ibid., p.222

4. Frere - The Anaphora, p.194. Frere quotes the rubrics and gives a reference to Brightman's Liturgies Eastern and Western, which is confusing because the rubrics do not appear in Brightman.

5. In Connolly's Liturgical Homilies of Narsai, p.130 and cf. Fortescue - The Mass, p.339.

have been wrong on both counts. In the first place neither Rome nor the East seem to have such a narrowly defined 'form of consecration' as Darragh supposed, since Rome can allow the Eastern invocation to follow the words of Institution, and the East can speak of the words of Institution and the invocation forming a continuous whole.¹ On the other hand the idea that East and West have agreed to differ, and each to allow the narrow and rigid view of the other to be a kind of second best, is not supported by the facts either. Rome appears to accept the Eastern rite only in so far as a rather different emphasis can be placed upon its invocation than is usual in the East. In fact any 'agreement to differ' that does exist is only made possible by Rome and the East not possessing such rigid views as Darragh would desire to attribute to them. It is clear that Darragh lost his argument with Frere. He descended in the end to saying things like;

If you will do me the honour of reading The Resurrection of the Flesh in recognition of which my University [Trinity College, Dublin] has conferred the D.D. on me, you will see, I think, that I am a diligent student of Christian origins. I may add that I know as well as you do yourself every scrap of 'fresh light' that has been thrown on liturgical problems in these recent years ...²

What had really hurt was Frere's implied suggestion that Darragh's scholarship might not be quite up to date.³

The other controversial exchange was more public. Again it was Nash who put the bishops' point of view in a reply to the Natal petition in which he said;

In general I should think that the position of the petitioners as against the Form proposed by the Bishops and so far accepted by the Province is this: They hold the extreme theory which attaches consecration to this or that special form of words.⁴

1. See supra, p. 140

2. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p. 226.

3. Ibid., p. 219

4. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, p. 71. This is a shrewd remark inasmuch as Natal, the diocese from which the petitioners came, is usually reckoned the most 'protestant' in the Province.

St Thomas, he said, had laid down the form of consecration as the words used in the Roman Mass - but these are not the same words as those used in the Book of Common Prayer - and Rome will allow no other form.¹ Nash, having saddled the petitioners with a charge of 'Romanising', proceeds to contrast the bishops' theology of consecration with that expressed in Considerations. The bishops, Nash said, desired to go back to the idea of the 'whole offering of priest and people, that wins a blessing, and in especial the whole prayer of consecration, not these words or those.'² Nash goes on to point out the difficulties of relying on the text or ceremonial of the Roman rite to prove the Western theology of consecration. He points out that in Te igitur and Quam oblationem there is language which suggests that the elements have already become the holy sacrifice before the narrative of Institution has been recited. And, to take a point of ceremonial, the rubric on genuflection was not inserted until 1570. To the petitioners' claim that the passage of the revised rite would provide two conflicting forms of consecration for use in the Province, Nash replied that the Scottish Episcopal Church already possessed two forms, one of them similar to the Alternative Form of the Province, and the other the Book of Common Prayer form. Further, he argued, the 'third rubric' is not to be taken as defining a 'form of consecration' but is entirely 'subordinate and unimportant'. There follows a spirited defence of the weakest point in the bishops' case, the 'third rubric', on three separate grounds: First,

1. For a reasonable statement of the Roman position see E. Bishop's appendix to Connolly op.cit. pp.126ff. On the origins of the 1549 narrative of the Institution see Gasquet & Bishop - Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer pp.444-8

2. Church Chronicle loc.cit.

Is it likely that the Bishops would issue a revised Form of Consecration Prayer ... and all the time intend no change? ¹

Secondly, rubrics are always subordinate to the text of a rite. Thirdly, the rubric on supplementary consecration was inserted into the 1662 Book after the rite had been in use for 100 years (i.e. since 1552) and such a rubric 'is without example outside our branch of the Church.'

Canon Morris Hodson, one of the signatories, replied for the petitioners.

We do not necessarily hold the extreme theory that attaches consecration to the pronouncing of one sentence. ²

But Hodson insists that this is not a matter to be decided by the opinion of scholars, but by the belief of the whole Church, or at least of a Patriarchate. He quotes from Frere³ a passage which minimises the differences between East and West and suggests that it would be inadvisable 'to take any steps towards the reinsertion of the Invocation.' Hodson maintains, as Darragh had done, that there are two possible forms for consecration, the Eastern and the Western, and asserts that no one province ought, on its own initiative, to depart from the tradition to which it has hitherto belonged. There are, he says, not two but six rites in use in the Province - the first, second and third revisions of the South African rite (i.e. 1918, 1919 & 1920), the Bloemfontein version of the 1920 Form,⁴ the Scottish Office used in some parts of the diocese of St. John's and the 1662 rite. Of these the 1918, 1662 and Bloemfontein rites are, Hodson argued, obviously Western. The nature of the 1920 rite, however, is more open to question. It is not Western, by Nash's own arguments quoted above. It is not Eastern, because the manual acts indicate

1. ibid. Nash also quotes a private letter from Bishop Maclean of Moray and Ross to the effect that the Easterns have no form for reconsecration. Church Chronicle Vol. XVIII. p. 111. and for other evidence to the same effect cf. Jasper op. cit. pp. 90ff.

2. Church Chronicle Vol. XVIII. p. 183.

3. Some Principles of Liturgical Reform p. 189.

4. supra. p. 121

that the words of Institution are not recited historically and because the invocation is not 'invested with the solemnity found in the Epiiclesis of the Eastern Liturgies.'¹ Therefore, Hodson claims, the South African rite possesses a third form of consecration, sanctioned by no Catholic consent or usage. It is Darragh's argument of the Considerations put into other words.

Both Gould and Bazeley attempted to answer Hodson. Gould pointed out that no hostile critic of the South African rite had cited any decree of Eastern or Western Christendom, fixing the 'moment of consecration'. Still less had anyone cited any decree which could serve as evidence of 'agreeing to differ'. Indeed, though it is generally assumed that there is a divergence between East and West in theories of consecration, there are very few specific references in the works of liturgiologists to any definition by either East or West of its doctrine.² To meet the objection of the petitioners that the 'second' invocation made the form of consecration in the Alternative Form different from that of the 1662 rite, Gould suggested that the 'Hear us, o merciful Father..' should be omitted. That would have made the 1662 form of narrative-of-Institution-preceded-by-an-invocation correspond more or less with the form of narrative-followed-by-invocation in the South African rite.³ Bazeley, independently, made the same suggestion, chiefly because he deprecated any attempt to follow the precedent of 1549.⁴ It is curious that the suggestion to omit the 1662 invocation was not made more often or pressed more vigorously than it was, when one remembers that the American and Scottish anaphoras both omit it.⁵ Another curiosity

1. cf. Darragh's argument supra. p. 144

2. but see Dix - The Shape of the Liturgy (2nd Ed.) p. 295 and E. Bishop in Connolly - The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai pp. 130n. & 146f.

3. Church Chronicle Vol. XVIII, p. 215

4. ibid. p. 231

5. but see supra. p. 138f

of this whole argument is that none of the protagonists seem to have noted that the bishops had included 'Hear us etc.' in the form for a second consecration.¹

Nash also returned answer to Hodson. Though he denied that the bishops had any intention of converting the South African rite into one of the Eastern type, he had, apparently been testing Eastern opinion on the Alternative Form. Moreover, for the first time, he admitted that the rubric on supplementary consecration was not altogether satisfactory.

Mr Berough, chaplain at our Crimean Church in Constantinople, writes that Professor Komnenos (of the Theological College at Halki) came to see him. He had studied the South African form of consecration and he pronounced it quite satisfactory.² I had specially called attention to the rubric for additional consecration, and he said very decidedly that the Epiklesis must be repeated in such cases. This Dr Frere, the 'Church Times' and others have urged. The matter of manual acts and reverences he did not appear to regard as important.³

Darragh, however, had the last word. He insisted that his objection was not to the 'Eastern' character of the Alternative Form, but to its not being clearly either Eastern or Western.⁴ Obviously Darragh and his fellow petitioners were not convinced by the arguments of Frere, Nash, Bazeley, and Gould. Perhaps it was not to be expected that they should be.

In the meantime the bishops had received yet another petition - this time from some of the clergy of the diocese of Cape Town. Though less strongly worded than the appeal from Natal, this petition was obviously intended to make the same point. The Cape Town petition pleaded that ito annul or subordinate the 1662 Epiklesis, while retaining it in connection with the words of Institution, is a serious

1. SUPRA. p. 116

2. cf. Russian Observations on the American Prayer Book (Alcuin Club) NB. pp. 2 & 35 - also quoted in Dix - The Share of the Liturgy p. 294.

3. Church Chronicle Vol. XVIII. p. 247

4. ibid. pp. 252.

departure from the English Tradition.¹ The petition asked that the new invocation should be made 'clearer and more definite and, if intended to consecrate, this should be unmistakably expressed.' It also said that the new invocation would be better placed before the words of Institution.

The leader of the new group of petitioners would seem to have been the Reverend Father H.P. Bull of the Society of St. John the Evangelist (Cowley Fathers), since it was he who defended and explained it publicly. Father Bull had worked in the diocese of Cape Town earlier in his ministry, but he was in 1921 Superior General of the community. According to the Cowley Evangelist² (official periodical of the S.S.J.E.) Bull arrived in Cape Town in the Holy Week of 1921, intending originally to stay for three weeks. The illness of one of the members of the community, however, led Father Bull to stay on for some time, long enough, in fact, to attend a session of the Cape Town Diocesan Synod. The Cowley Evangelist does not mention the Alternative Form, but Bull's longer stay in Cape Town gave him the opportunity to become familiar with the rite, and attendance at the Synod allowed him to make contact with those dissatisfied with it. No doubt his fortuitous stay in Cape Town accounted for the apparent surprise caused by the presentation of the petition.³ It is otherwise hard to explain why the petition should have been drawn up so suddenly and unexpectedly after such a long interval. There was a gap of fully twelve months and more between the publication of the revised rite of 1920 and the Cape Town petition.

1. ibid. p.199

2. Cowley Evangelist August 1921 p.121.

3. cf. Church Chronicle Vol.XVIII,p.215 quoted on p.160 infra
I am indebted to Fr. Gardner, S.S.J.E., for help in obtaining this information

Bull's arguments, in his covering letter to the petition, agree with Darragh's in outline. There is the same insistence on the absolute distinction between East and West; the same insistence that there can be no middle course. The English rite has always, Bull argued, belonged to the Western tradition, but the new prayer of consecration is Eastern. So 'On Sunday the old form is used, and is believed to be complete. On Monday, under the new form, the same words are used, but are believed to be incomplete.'¹ This whole insistence on the completeness and incompleteness of forms and words is so utterly foreign to the thinking behind the bishops' statements about the theology of consecration² that it is not surprising that neither side managed to convince the other.

Father Bull's second point was that the 1919/20 Alternative Form was indefinite about the fact of consecration itself. He argued that the combination of 'Hear us etc.' with the words of Institution in 1662 was quite definite proof that a consecration of the elements was effected. The new form of the invocation was a prayer for the illapse of the Spirit 'upon us'. This was really all that Bull's argument amounted to.³ It does not add much weight to the objections put forward by Darragh in Considerations; but it is a sign that the dissatisfaction with the revised rite was growing, and was now widespread. Gould wrote of the new petition;

Two of the most justly loved and honoured priests in South Africa, Mr Darragh and Father Bull --- head the protests against the Alternative Form. Arguments that have been discussed in Natal for twelve months, suddenly emerge from Cape Town, and are heard from the Transvaal.⁴

The distant mutterings from the Transvaal, heard by Gould were the expressions of the uneasiness of some of

1. ibid., p.207.

2. see e.g. supra. p.150.

3. Church Chronicle Vol.XVIII.p.215

4. ibid.,p.207.

the clergy in the diocese of Pretoria. In June 1921 a pamphlet was published in that diocese entitled The Liturgy or Order for the Celebration of Holy Communion¹. The front cover bore the printed note - 'Proof copy for further consideration and report.' From the way in which the rite itself is set out in the pamphlet it is clear that it is not meant for use in celebrating the Eucharist - at any rate at the stage reached at the time of the pamphlet - but is for study and further revision. Some prayers are not printed in full but are indicated simply by the first and last words; references, printed in heavier type than the rest of the text, have been inserted into the draft to refer the reader to explanatory notes printed at the end of the pamphlet. Only three copies of this draft liturgy can now be traced. One is in the Central Church Record Library; another is in the South African Public Library; the third was amongst the papers of the late Canon Gould. It is not certain for whom this draft was intended, but its source can hardly be in doubt. The outline of the liturgy is:

Either the Litany or the Lord's Prayer and Collect for Purity,
Ninefold Kyries,
Gloria in Excelsis (revised translation),
Collect, Epistle, & Gospel,
Sermon and Dismissal of Catechumens,
Creed (revised translation),
Offertory,
Prayer for the Church (with some additions and alterations)
Sursum Corda, Preface, and Sanctus,
Consecration Prayer,²
Lord's Prayer,
Pax, Agnus, and Priest's communion,
Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words,
Either Prayer of Humble Access or 'Lord, I am not worthy etc.'
Communion of the People,
Either proper Post-Communion or 1662 Prayer of Thanksgiving,
Blessing.

The anaphora is interesting. It is headed 'Consecration' and begins with the salutation and the Sursum Corda and then proceeds as in 1662 as far as '... Everlasting God', though Frere's proposed re-punctuation of the Preface has been

1. The pamphlet is dated 'Johannesburg, 24th June 1921', but bears no printers' name.

2. See appendix 4 infra, for the text of the anaphora of this draft rite.

more or less adopted.¹ The Sanctus is in its full form - Sanctus, Hosanna, Benedictus, Hosanna - and then the prayer continues, 'holy indeed and Blessed indeed art Thou, O Almighty God, our heavenly Father ...'.² The rest of the prayer is much as it was in the 1919 rite, but the invocation runs,

We entreat thee that thy Holy Spirit may descend upon us and upon this oblation of the Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

The rubric providing for supplementary consecration says that the form is to be 'as Alternative Form, latest edition, 1920', that is to say 'Hear us, O merciful Father in remembrance of me'.

Since the pamphlet is dated from Johannesburg it is reasonable to suppose that it was framed in the diocese in which that city then lay, the diocese of Pretoria. A comparison of the draft liturgy with the reports of the sub-committee of the bishop of Pretoria's senate³ confirms this supposition. Pages 6 to 15 of the sub-committee's Report to the Lord Bishop of Pretoria, dated 31 January 1919, deal with 'The Liturgy or Order for Celebration of Holy Communion' - the wording is the same as the title of the draft rite. The general principles 'approved by the Committee' are;

Gloria in Excelsis to be at the beginning - N.B. This hymn requires amendment.

The Prayer for the Church to remain as at present.

The Sermon and Notices to precede the Creed (i.e. before the dismissal of the Catechumens)

The Consecration Prayer to be followed by: Prayer of Oblation, Lord's Prayer (with introduction and doxology), The Communion of the Priest. The Communion Devotions en bloc. Communion of the People. Post Communion or Thanksgiving. Blessing.

Other suggestions from the report include substituting the Kyries for the decalogue, adding the Benedictus to the Sanctus, and the use of the Agnus Dei. The recommendations regarding the consecration prayer were;

Connecting link. Read 'Holy indeed and Blessed indeed art

1. Cf. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p. 203. Srawley gives the precedents for both punctuations of the preface in Liturgy and Worship, (Ed. Lowther Clarke), p.335.

2. Cf. pp. 102-n. supra.

3. supra, p. 98

Thou, O Almighty God, our Heavenly Father ..¹
'to take our nature upon him' - approved.
His ONE oblation. stet. (Not OWN as Scottish).
The link for the Prayer of Oblation, 'Wherefore' - approved.

The best way of... [providing a reference in the anaphora
to the Holy Spirit] ... appears to be that suggested by Frere.²

The agreements between this report and the draft rite are so marked that there must have been a direct dependence of the one upon the other. The draft rite is the continuation of the work done in the report. Since the report was intended for the bishop of Pretoria, and since the rite depends upon it, the rite was probably intended for him too.³ What happened to it after that is a matter for conjecture. Some copies of the rite appear to have been circulated outside the diocese of Pretoria.⁴ But no copy of the pamphlet has been preserved amongst the papers of the Liturgical Committee or of Episcopal Synod.⁵

It is curious that the draft liturgy should have been published so late. The various parts of the Pretoria report are dated between 13 November 1918 and 13 February 1919. They are all earlier, that is to say, than the session of Episcopal Synod that issued the Alternative Form of 1919. The draft liturgy is dated 24 June 1921, more than two years after the Pretoria committee made its report. It seems extraordinary that the committee, having gone to such great pains to produce so voluminous a report (it runs to nearly sixty pages of single-spaced foolscap typewriting) should have

-
1. A note in the report refers here to Frere's memorandum to the bishops of 1918, paragraph 4. (see supra, p. 94)
 2. Another note refers to paragraph 8 of Frere's memorandum. (See Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, pp. 203ff. and supra, p. 95) Then, in the body of the report follows the actual wording of Frere's proposed invocation which agrees more or less with the invocation in the final draft liturgy. (See infra, p. 165)
 3. By this time Furse, the bishop to whom the report had been made, had been translated to St Albans. The new bishop of Pretoria was Neville Talbot. (See p. 93 supra.)
 4. Priests in the diocese of Cape Town remember that copies of the rite produced in Johannesburg (chiefly memorable for the transferring of the Gloria to the beginning of the rite) were to be seen in Cape Town.
 5. The bishops had, however, seen the original Pretoria report which was circulated to all diocesans.

neglected to do anything further for two whole years, while the progress of revision made their work out of date and less valuable.¹ Still more extraordinary is the fact that, after such a long period of neglect, it should have been thought worth while to publish a printed form of a rite embodying the suggestions of the report.

The explanation of this curious delay is to be found in Gould's remark on the growth of opposition to the 1919 form quoted above.² The work of the Pretoria committee was completed too late for it to have much effect upon the Alternative Form of 1919/20.³ Once the bishops had issued their revised rite and it had been approved by Provincial Synod in 1919, there was no further point in the Pretoria Committee proceeding with an independent revision of their own. But as soon as the objections to the invocation of 1919 had been made public and it was clear that there was a substantial body of opinion which did not favour the Alternative Form, the Pretoria committee seized the opportunity to revive their own suggestions and published them in the form of a draft rite. In most respects the rite was modelled even more closely upon Frere's suggestions of 1918 than the official Alternative Form of 1919 had been. But by 1921 Frere was discredited in one particular amongst those who preferred a more 'Western' form of consecration. In the previous year, for instance, Darragh had written, 'Father Frere is entirely within a scholar's rights in preferring an Epiklesis to the Western Form. Both are of ecumenical allowance. But in every living liturgy with an Epiklesis, it neither precedes nor follows the Form of Consecration. It is the Form of Consecration.'⁴ Frere was plainly regarded,

1. Some of the comments in the report are based on the Form of 1918 (The Proposed Form) and by 1921 were no longer relevant.

2. Supra, p. 160

3. Supra, p. 100

4. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVII, p. 340.

then, as one who 'preferred the Epiklesis'. Ridout, the secretary of the Pretoria committee,¹ wrote a letter to the Church Chronicle in which he said,

..in regard to the clause 'hallow this oblation'² This clause was suggested by Dr Frere in July 1918 in his 'Rough Notes on the Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy'. But clearly the words are not intended to be consecratory.³ His clause runs 'this oblation of the Body and Blood of thy Son'. I was one of a committee of this Diocese, appointed by Bishop Furse, who endorsed that clause, also with no intention that it be regarded as consecratory. Everyone of that committee whom I have been able to consult, now desires their deletion. And the present Bishop of Pretoria has given permission for this Diocese to use the latest Alternative Form with the omission of this clause and of the words 'and creatures of thine own'.⁴

Ridout's letter was written at about the same time as the draft liturgy was published. The invocations of the draft runs:

we entreat thee that thy Holy Spirit may descend upon us and upon this oblation of the Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

Frere's original suggestion had been:

May thy Holy Spirit descend upon these offerings and hallow this oblation of the Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

What the Pretoria committee had done was to take Frere's suggestion and omit from it the one phrase that had appeared in the Alternative Form, 'hallow this oblation'. The other differences between the two forms, Frere's and the committee's, are slight and are to be explained by the fact that the committee desired that the prayer for the illapse of the Spirit should not in any way specify any activity as a result of the illapse. The other phrase in the South African anaphora directly derived from Frere, 'We offer here unto thy Di(y)ne Majesty these sacred gifts and creatures of thine own, this holy bread of eternal life, this cup of everlasting salvation', was also omitted.⁵

1. See supra, p. 99

2. The first part of Ridout's letter was devoted to the problem of the time-sequence of the liturgy.

3. But see supra, p. 120

4. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, p. 268.

5. For the anaphora of the Pretoria draft rite see appendix 4.

The authors of the draft rite were uneasy about Frere's form of the invocation, and particularly about those parts of it which had been used in the Alternative Form, and this, in spite of the fact, that almost all Frere's other suggestions contained in his memorandum of 1918 had been incorporated into the Pretoria proposal. The long delayed publication of the committee's rite was the result of the public and heated controversy over the South African invocation.

Episcopal Synod met, for the second time that year, on 7 November 1921. Liturgical matters were considered on 15 November and Phelps presented a report from the Liturgical Committee. The report stated that, while many people had expressed their gratitude for the Alternative Form, 'a widely signed memorial makes it clear that if the phrases "these sacred gifts and creatures of thine own" and "that he may hallow this oblation" were removed the Alternative Form would be generally accepted...'¹ The minutes show that this report was adopted, not in full, but with amendments. According to the official report of the proceedings of the Synod subsequently published² the only material amendment consisted of substituting;

This Synod desires to emphasise Note (1) of the Notes on the Revision.

for a passage of similar import in the original report. Note (1) of the Notes on the Revision (i.e. the Preface to the Alternative Form of 1919) asserted that revision was 'consistent with a deep affection for the Book of Common Prayer.' The original clause suggested by the Liturgical Committee denied that the revised rite could 'be taken as implying any doubt as to the validity of the Form in the Book of Common Prayer'. The difference in meaning is very slight.

Synod resolved to excise the phrases referred to

1. A copy of the text of this report is preserved in the files of the bishops of Kimberley.
2. Church Chronicle, Vol. xviii, p. 396.

and there can be no doubt that, from a practical point of view at least, they were well advised to do so. The diocese of St John's had passed a resolution in synod asking the bishops to reconsider the rite of 1919. The clergy of the diocese of Bloemfontein had been given permission by their vicar-general to omit the offensive phrases. The bishop of Pretoria had adopted the same course and the liturgical sub-committee of his senate had even contemplated an independent revision. The great body of the clergy of the diocese of Natal had petitioned against the invocation and the clergy of Cape Town had joined them in their protest. Even in Grahamstown, the very home of revision, there were protests and dissatisfaction. Only the missionary dioceses of Zululand and Lebombo, Southern Rhodesia in the far north, the remote island diocese of St Helena, and the two small rural dioceses of George and Kimberley had made no public protest. But Synod resolved at the same time 'to emphasise' the very important statement about the form of consecration which has already been referred to.

....they hold to the primitive view that, when thanksgiving has been offered in prayerful trust that God's power will accomplish His purpose, we then can securely believe in the Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist, without debating the exact moment when the Presence was granted. This applies to the Canon equally in the E.C.P. and in the Alternative Form. We are not tied to the belief that in the E.C.P. the narrative is the moment, any more than that in the Alternative Form the Epiclesis is the moment.

To this they added the statement that

.... the excision .. still leaves the memorial of the Holy Ghost in its normal position in the orderly sequence of the Canon, and thus the Canon is in close agreement with the earliest form of the Liturgy...¹

Thus the amendment to the 1919 form first suggested by Hulme was adopted and the so-called Bloemfontein use, became the use of the Province so far as the invocation was concerned. The notorious 'third rubric' was altered to read, as in the

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, p. 396.

present South African rite, 'either in both kinds, repeating the words of the Consecration Prayer beginning at "Hear us, O Merciful Father", and ending at "heavenly benediction"; or in either kind according to the form given for this purpose in the Book of Common Prayer.'¹

The Liturgical Committee also recommended that the advice of the 'Lambeth' Committee on Liturgical Matters should be sought on a number of points. Episcopal Synod apparently approved this recommendation² but nothing seems to have been done to implement the suggestion, at least for the time being.³

Clearly the 'Western' school had gained a notable concession.

Some of us had hoped that any controversy between the so-called Eastern and Western theories of consecration could have been avoided. But it was not to be. The Natal clergy, headed by the late Dr Darragh, made the latent opposition vocal in a petition addressed to the Episcopal Synod ... and two private revisions were printed for circulation, one in Johannesburg, ⁴ and the other in Natal. ⁵ With thankfulness one records that all this activity lead [sc. 'led'] not to barren controversy but to concord. The different parties agreed to the compromise already mentioned, by which the Episcopal Synod of 1921 removed the disturbing words from the consecration prayer. ⁶

This is Gould's account of what happened, written two years after the controversy had ended. He represented the result as a compromise, and a compromise it was in that the invocation was retained, but in a vaguer and reduced form. The bishops' firm and unequivocal statement about the form and moment of consecration means, however, that the rationale of consecration had not been compromised by the change. The whole section of the rite from Sursum Corda onwards was labelled CONSECRATION - there was no 'moment' specially emphasised.

1. For discussion of this rubric see infra, p. 193f.

2. It is printed in the official report of Synod: Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, p. 396.

3. See infra, p. 181f.

4. This is the Pretoria draft rite.

5. This obviously refers to the Natal draft rite, (infra, pp 175) which was not, however, issued till after Episcopal Synod had met in 1921, and so could not have influenced the 1922 rite.

6. Gould in Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p. 756.

In every other respect the rite of 1922 must have seemed a triumph for the Westernising party. The bishops' statement considerably modified the completeness of that triumph; and the anamnesis and invocation were, in fact, retained. Yet the report of the Episcopal Synod from which the bishops' statement has been quoted is comparatively obscure. The Western group might be excused for thinking that they had won their case.

The excision of the two offending phrases was the only change made in the 1922 edition of the Alternative Form, and the anaphora in that edition is identical with the final (1924/9) edition.¹ Some unimportant amendments had yet to be made to the rest of the rite but otherwise, apart from one or two experiments to be discussed in the next chapter, the revision of the rite was done.

The^{re} remains one problem of interest and importance which is still unsolved, and at this point some attempt must be made to evaluate the influence of Bazeley and Gould upon the course of revision after the publication of Proposals in 1913.² There is a strong and persistent tradition in the Province that they were largely responsible for the form the revised eucharistic rite has taken. Certainly they both defended the South African liturgy faithfully and loyally.³ Bishop Fisher has, in private conversation, given it as his opinion that Phelps, his predecessor as chairman of the Liturgical Committee, was much influenced by Bazeley and Gould.⁴ There is evidence which indicates that there was a very close association between Phelps and the authors of Proposals. A copy of the Proposed Form which once belonged to Gould is inscribed 'With the love and blessing of F.R.Grahamstown'.

1. For the text of the final anaphora see appendix 6 infra.

2. This problem was really raised at the end of Chapter Two, but it has seemed best to reserve a fuller discussion of it till this point when the relevant facts have been set out.

3. Cf. e.g. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVI, pp. 329 & 250, XVII, p. 231, XVIII, p. 215, etc.

4. This is confirmed by the preface to the Proposed Form of 1918, see supra, pp. 91f.

Phelps also sent copies of the 1920 edition of the Alternative Form to the other two,¹ and he appears to have continued this practice for on 14 December 1930, after the eucharistic rite had been finally fixed, he sent Gould a copy of the revised Occasional Offices. The covering letter runs:²

My Dear Charles,

I got some advance copies for use at the Episcopal Synod, and as there is this one free I send it to you with my love, and in gratitude for all you have done in the matter of Revision. It is, of course, quite private till the copies are on sale.....

The revision of the Occasional Offices lies outside the scope of this study and, though there is reason to believe that Gould played some part in that phase of revision also, this letter is quoted only to indicate how close Gould was to Phelps throughout the whole course of the early history of the South African Prayer Book.

Phelps apparently took pains to keep Gould informed of the proceedings of Provincial Synod where these affected the Prayer Book. Gould was not a member of the Synod either in 1919 when the first Alternative Form was approved, or in 1924 when the final form was passed for the first time. Phelps's telegram to Gould after the passage of the 1919 form has already been quoted.³ On 14 November 1924 Phelps again wired Gould from Cape Town, saying, 'Alternative Form passed Synod as printed thus fixed for next five years.' There is no room for doubt that the association between these three, Phelps, Bazeley, and Gould, was very close and continued over a long period of time.

There is no clear evidence that Bazeley had any more direct influence upon the course of revision. He was one of the assessors of 1919. Whether that meant that he played any great part in the framing of the rite is uncert-

1. The copy sent to Gould is in my possession, together with the earlier one mentioned above. The copy sent to Bazeley is in the South African Public Library. Both are inscribed as having been presented to the owners by Phelps.

2. This letter is in the Gould Collection in St Paul's College Library.

3. Supra, p. 122

ain; but it is unlikely that the assessors were very influential.¹ A letter written to the Church Chronicle² spoke of being 'grateful to Mr Bazeley and the Diocese of Grahamstown for putting things in motion' but this is probably a reference to Proposals and the Grahamstown Sacred Synod of 1917. Bazeley certainly remained keenly interested in the work of revision long after 1917 and he, like Gould, was in the forefront of the controversy over the invocation. When Bazeley went to England for nine months in 1921, his locum tenens at St Paul's College ' had to handle a certain amount of correspondence addressed to Warden Bazeley. When, however, I discovered that any letter dealt with revision it was, of course, re-addressed to him in England. Of these letters I only remember a long one from Fr. Hill, C.R. protesting strongly against the epiklesis.'³ But this, again, is proof of no more than interest in the work of revision; it cannot be held to prove that Bazeley was directly responsible for the shape that revision took in any particular.

It is true that there are several books in St Paul's College library⁴ inscribed:

This book was used by the Revd. J.S. Bazeley, third Warden of the College, in the compilation of the S.A. Liturgy, which was shaped within the walls of this College.

These books were probably given to the College, after Bazeley's death, by Gould, into whose possession they had passed.⁵ The inscription is not in Gould's hand, but in the same hand as the date and shelf mark filled in when the book was put into the library. The books certainly did belong to Bazeley and bear his characteristic signature on the flyleaf, but the inscription is quite valueless historically. Not only was it made twenty years after the events referred to, but one of

1. Supra, pp. 123f.

2. Vol. XVI (1919), p. 269 - a letter from Canon M.C. Hodson.

3. Extract from a private letter to me from the Rt. Revd. B.W. Peacey, sometime bishop of Lebombo.

4. For a list of the books see appendix 7, infra.

5. See infra, pp. 216f.

the books so grandiosely inscribed - a copy of the American Prayer Book - was not printed until 1929, the year that the South African liturgy became finally canonical. To speak of the South African liturgy as having been shaped within the walls of St Paul's College is in any case ridiculous, though the anaphora of Proposals might quite properly be so described. Most of the books which bear the inscription were indeed used by Bazeley and Gould in their work on Proposals and are listed as authorities in that pamphlet. The inscription was probably the product of a librarian's flowery imagination and is no more than a variant of the tradition which attributes the South African liturgy to the authors of Proposals. It may be the result of a mistaken identification of Proposals with the Alternative Form but it must be discounted as evidence of Bazeley's part in revision.

If there is nothing to show that Bazeley played any direct part in the shaping of the rite, there is but little more evidence of Gould's influence after Proposals had been published. It is clear that the anaphora of the Proposed Form of 1918 was taken from his article Revision of the Eucharistic Canon,¹ but hardly any part of this anaphora, except those parts which were taken from 1662, has survived in the final form of the South African rite. Much has been said of the inscription written in Bazeley's books; there is an inscription in one of Gould's books which, while it can hardly be said to be evidence, may be more significant for a true understanding of the situation than the formal inscription which attributes the shaping of the South African liturgy to Bazeley. Gould had a habit of filing press-cuttings, letters, and notes in the books to which they referred, and he scribbled many cross-references and comments on flyleaves and margins.

1. Supra, pp. 90f.

These are nearly always roughly written in pencil, but on the flyleaf of Dowden's Workmanship of the Prayer Book Gould inscribed a long quotation. It is no scribble this time, but is written in black ink in a beautiful and formal copper-plate hand, which is nevertheless recognisably Gould's. The writer has obviously been at great pains to make the inscription as neat and as careful as possible¹ and it must have meant something of importance to him. This is what Gould wrote:

"We have done a good deal of business with Prayer-Book revision, though I could not get my points carried. I wish I was readier in argument and more persuasive, as I am often right when others are wrong and cannot get enough votes to carry things." - John Wordsworth to his wife in E.W.Watson's Life, p.376. Compare Dowden's little influence on the successive Scottish revisions.

Whether Gould realised how apposite this quotation was to his own case or not, the comparison which he drew between Wordsworth and Dowden might well have been extended to the authors of Proposals and the part they played in South African revision. Inevitably and rightly the names of Bazeley and Gould are linked with the revised liturgy. The tradition which holds them responsible for the form it took, dies hard; yet there is very little concrete evidence to substantiate it. The full truth which lies behind the tradition it is impossible now to discover.

If Bazeley and Gould did not devise, they certainly approved the Alternative Form. The letter which they wrote in reply to criticisms of Proposals indicates that they were very soon prepared to accept something much less radical than the anaphora attached to their pamphlet.² Gould's later pamphlet, Revision of the Eucharistic Canon, marked a further modification of his views.³ His memorandum to Episcopal Synod in 1927 is a complete acceptance of bishop Frere's

1. Where there are two consecutive "s's", for instance, the second is always written as an "f" without the cross-stroke.

2. Supra, p. 71

3. Supra, p. 80

pattern for Anglican anaphoras.¹ Nevertheless when Bazeley and Gould attempted to defend the 1919 rite they both returned to the theories advanced by W.C.Bishops² In this they remained consistent, and, indeed, Bazeley's views seem to have changed less than Gould's. In 1920 Bazeley was still reiterating the argument he had used in Proposals and at the Sacred Synod of 1917 - that our Lord's command 'do this' included by implication 'give thanks'.³ He was still insisting that the invocation was a universal feature of the primitive liturgies and that its 'normal' place was after the narrative of the institution.⁴ In 1921, in an article entitled Liturgical Revision in the Anglican Communion,⁵ he referred to W.C.Bishop, stressed the need for logical order in the anaphora and the essential character of the thanksgivings, including them again within the terms of the Dominical 'do this'. This article defended the anaphora of the Alternative Form of 1919, an anaphora as different from that of Proposals as chalk is from cheese, for from 1919 onwards the South African consecration prayer was really an embodiment of Frere's pattern for a revised Anglican rite. But Bazeley continued to advocate its adoption by the Province with the same arguments which he had used in Proposals. In theory, then, Bazeley and Gould continued to advocate the theology of consecration put forward in Proposals, but in practice they conceded that an Anglican revision of the consecration prayer was not likely to be so radical as that which they had originally proposed.

1. Supra, p. 72

2. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVI, p. 350 (Bazeley) & p. 329 (Gould).

3. Ibid., Vol. XVII, p. 231.

4. Ibid.

5. Theology, Vol. II, pp. 161ff.

Chapter Six.

The rest of the story is straightforward and simple. Episcopal Synod made the significant decision to omit the 'disturbing' phrases from the invocation on 15 November 1921. Four days later a new draft-liturgy was published in Durban. A covering letter attached to the draft described it as the work of the 'Natal Committee'. This must have been the same committee as had been 'constituted subsequently to the discussion ... at the recent Clergy Conference' and had commissioned Darragh to draw up the Natal petition.¹ The draft rite was apparently sent out to a number of people, though few copies of it now exist. The covering letter, signed by Darragh, is addressed 'To the Clergy of the Province of South Africa and extra-Provincial Students of Liturgiology.' It begins by stating that the intention of the Natal committee was to ask for criticisms and suggestions before the draft was submitted to the bishops. The liturgy itself, like Darragh's covering letter, has an imposing title;- 'An Alternative Liturgy or Order for the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist and Administration of the Holy Communion, Set forth by authority for use in the Church of the Province of South Africa. 192-'.² The blank in the date indicates that the latter part of the title reflects the hopes of those who framed the rite, rather than its factual status. Moreover a note printed in brackets at the top of the cover page reads:

Draft of suggested amendments to be presented to the Committee of Bishops which has been appointed to reconsider the Alternative Form of 1920. The Amendments are incorporated in the text to facilitate a decision on their suitability and appropriateness.

The liturgy was quite obviously, then, without official standing in the province. It was strictly a revision of the 1919/20

1. Cf. *supra*, p. 133f.

2. The pamphlet was printed by John Singleton & Sons of Durban, and is undated. The covering letter is dated 19 November 1921.

Alternative Form and not a fresh adaptation of the 1662 Book; yet it was a drastic revision of the Alternative Form in many ways.

The order of the proposed rite was:

Invocation of the Trinity,
Psalm XLIII (with the antiphon arranged as versicle and response),
Either the penitential section from the B.C.P. or a short confession based on the Sarum and Roman models but without invocation of saints,
Lord's Prayer,
Prayer from the Sarum rite, 'Take away from us all our iniquities..',
Collect for Purity (really a reduplication of the preceding prayer),
Decalogue, ninefold Kyries, or Summary of the Law (From Deut.vi.5. and Lev.xix.8.)
Collect, epistle, and gospel,
Creed,
Offertory Prayer (similar to prayer in present South African rite),
Prayer for the Church (greatly altered),
Sursum corda, Preface, Sanctus, and Benedictus,
Consecration Prayer (revised),
Agnus,
Prayer of Humble Access or 'Lord, I am not worthy etc.',
Communion,
Prayer of Thanksgiving,
Gloria in Excelsis,
Versicle and response, 'Let us depart in peace etc.',
Blessing. 1

The consecration prayer of this rite is specifically stated by rubric to begin immediately after the Benedictus. The sanctus is in its 1662 form, ending 'Glory be to Thee, O Lord Most High', and is followed by the Benedictus and Hosanna. Since the Natal committee obviously thought of the Sanctus and Benedictus as quite distinct from the consecration prayer it is not surprising to find that the opening words of the prayer do not echo the closing words of the Benedictus. Instead the prayer starts with the phrase used in the 1919 Form, 'All Glory and Thanksgiving be to Thee ...'. The first part of the Natal prayer is exactly as the prayer is printed in 1662, except that it has the phrase 'to take our nature

1. This rite has several points of similarity with the Pretoria rite (see supra, p. 161), but there is no evidence of direct dependence.

upon Him', and the invocation is amended to read;

Hear us, O merciful Father, and graciously send down Thy Holy Spirit upon these Thy creatures, that He may make this bread the precious Body, and this wine the precious Blood, of Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, according to His holy institution - Who in the same night

This invocation was taken, with very few changes, from the Liturgy of S. John Chrysostom.¹ The whole part of the prayer corresponding to the 1662 consecration prayer is printed in capital letters and concludes with an 'Amen'. Then follows the rest of the anaphora of the 1919 Form, printed as a separate prayer and in ordinary type. The second invocation was changed to read:

and we humbly beseech Thee to pour Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these Sacred Mysteries of Christ's Body and Blood, to the intent that we may fruitfully receive the same and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction.

Then 'Amen' is said again before the rest of the prayer is recited.

The implications of this rearrangement of the consecration prayer are important, especially when they are compared with the argument Darragh had put forward in Considerations. There is obviously a very different approach to the theology of consecration. Since Darragh signed the covering letter which went out with the draft rite, it is convenient to regard him as the author of the rite. No doubt, officially, both Considerations and the draft liturgy were the work of the Natal committee; but Darragh appears to have been at least the moving spirit behind both pamphlets. The important thing, however, is not the authorship so much as the marked change in attitude. The committee (which probably means Darragh) had changed its mind, for the Natal draft rite does not appear to regard the words of Institution as alone consecratory. The whole of the prayer from 'All Glory'

¹. Cf. the invocation from S. Chrysostom quoted in Considerations, p. 5n. and in Brightman - Liturgies Eastern and Western, pp. 386f. For the text of the whole draft anaphora see appendix 5 infra.

to the end of the narrative of Institution is printed in capital letters. The rubric directing the form for supplementary consecration is identical with that of the Alternative Form of 1919, prescribing the use of the whole prayer from 'Hear us, O merciful Father' to 'Do this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance of me.'¹ Remembering the importance which Darragh had attached to the rubric in the 1919 form we can hardly doubt that he intended it to define the 'form of consecration'.² It is, therefore, of the highest importance to note that this form of consecration included the invocation 'Hear us, O merciful Father', in its new shape. It is, in wording though not position, an invocation of the Greek type, so that the form of consecration in the Natal rite is not the words of Institution alone, but these words together with the amended invocation. The only difference between the Natal rite and the 1919 form is the position of the invocation and the fact that the Natal invocation is itself far more precisely worded and far more 'Eastern'.

It is worth noting that the Natal rite does not solve the time-sequence problem. In altering the wording of the 1662 invocation on a Greek model it has removed from the invocation any sense of futurity and makes it a prayer for present action. Cranmer's 1549 invocation avoided that implication by specifically relating the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit to the words of Institution - 'With thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts...'.³ Darragh's criticism of the invocation of 1919/20 might be alleged in return against the Natal rite. In the latter there is a very strongly worded

1. But of course the meaning of parts of that prayer had been altered.

2. Cf. *supra*, pp. 136, 149

3. Cf. Dowden - The Workmanship of the Prayer Book, (2nd. Ed.) pp. 4ff. and see the text of the Natal anaphora in appendix 5, *infra*.

invocation which, taken at its face value, seems to speak of consecration being effected at the moment of its recitation. This invocation is then followed by the words of Institution. Because the Natal committee used a Greek model rather than 1549, all they have managed to suggest is that consecration is already effected before the recitation of the narrative is even begun. If the words 'that He may make etc.' had been used at any other point in the prayer by the official revisers of the province, they would certainly have been interpreted in this absolute sense by Darragh and his supporters.

The other point of interest is the 'Amen' after the second invocation - now a prayer for fruitful reception. Compare with this Darragh's remarks about the South African invocation.

The epiclesis in the Alternative Form is an excellent preparation for consecration, but no form of Consecration, known to East or West, follows. No pause is made to acknowledge a great act of God the Holy Ghost. The service goes on without the faintest sign by word or act, that Our Lord has vouchsafed His Sacramental Presence - not so much as an Amen.¹

To have introduced the Amen after the amended invocation, now not to be regarded as in any way effecting consecration, is surely evidence of a thinking far more muddled than anything in the Alternative Form.

1922, the year after the bishops' compromise and the publication of the Natal rite, seems to have been, liturgically speaking, a quiet one, partly owing, perhaps, to the fact that it was also the year in which Darragh died.² The correspondence columns of the Church Chronicle were freer from reference to revision than at any time since the end of the war. Yet when Episcopal Synod met on 13 November 1922 it almost incredibly attempted a further revision of the pro-anaphora of the rite. The form that this revision took

1. Considerations, p.8.

2. The date is incorrectly given in Historical Records, p.644. Darragh actually died on 22 November 1922.

shows the influence of the Pretoria and Natal draft rites. The first Lord's Prayer was omitted, and was replaced by an invocation of the Trinity and the antiphon to Psalm XLIII (but, curiously, not the Psalm itself). Proper offertory sentences for use at the greater festivals and an offertory prayer were provided. This prayer now appears in the final version of the rite and it has a curious history. Ultimately it derives from the English coronation service and the Sarum Missa pro rege.¹ Gould had advocated that it should be adopted as early as 1918.² A version of it was included in the Natal rite, and from there it found its way into the final form. A copy of the 1922 edition of the Alternative Form, preserved in the files of the bishops of Kimberley, is interesting on this point. The prayer is written into the printed form of the service in pencil, presumably by bishop Gore Browne who was bishop of Kimberley at the time. Bishop Gore Browne wrote the prayer first in one form and later corrected it to another, as though the wording were being worked over in synod. If this is what the pencilled note means, it shows that members of Episcopal Synod as a whole, for the bishop was not a member of the Liturgical Committee, took an active part in the details of revision.

Various changes were also made in the Prayer for the Church and the present versicle and response were inserted before the Prayer of Thanksgiving. These were taken from the Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure of 1923,³ or, more probably, from its source in the 'Orange Book'.⁴ They did not appear in the English Revised Book of 1928. Extra post-communion collects and several new prefaces were also added to the Alternative Form of 1923. The only changes

1. Pullan - The Book of Common Prayer, (3rd. Ed.), p57.

2. Church Chronicle, Vol. XV. p. 269.

3. N.A. 84, p. 68.

4. Proposals for the Alternative Prayer Book, Vol. I., p. 51.

in the anaphora were the insertion of 'indeed' after 'All Glory and Thanksgiving' and the transference of the word 'made' from after the bracketed phrase in the first paragraph to before it. Both these changes were rescinded again in the following year. The 1923 edition seems to have been purely experimental.¹ It was described as 'faddist' by one critic and a great many of the changes proposed in it were abandoned for the final edition in 1924.

Phelps, as convener of the Liturgical Committee, published a schedule of the chief of these alterations early in 1923.² He also reported that a copy of the newly revised experimental edition was to be sent to the committee of liturgical experts appointed by the archbishop of Canterbury in terms of the resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1920.³ The committee was to be asked its opinion of the rite as a whole and also on certain particular points, the translation of the Gloria in excelsis, the method of consecration, and the position of the fraction. The Natal rite had made provision for the 'greater fraction' ~~to be made~~ either during the prayer of Oblation, immediately after the words 'bounden duty and service; or at the end of the Lord's Prayer. None of the official revisions up to and including 1922 had made any provision for a fraction (other than the 'breaking' directed amongst the manual acts). In 1923 the words 'Then shall the Priest break the bread and..' were added to the rubric immediately after the Prayer of Humble Access. The bishop of Kimberley, whose pencilled notes on the 1922 edition have already been referred to, wrote a marginal comment, 'Two fractions provided for. The matter to be referred to the Committee in England.' After the Gloria he wrote, 'The Gloria

1. 'True to their policy of inviting suggestions the Bishops collected a number of changes in an edition put forth for purely experimental use in 1923.' Gould in Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p. 756.

2. Ibid., Vol. XX, p. 120.

3. Ibid.; and cf. Report of the Lambeth Conference (S.P.C.K.) 1920, p. 36, and Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England, p. 51, for the text of resolution 28 of the Lambeth Conference.

to stay as it is until the text is settled by scholars.'

It has already been noted that Episcopal Synod had resolved to send a copy of the 1922 edition to the archbishop of Canterbury's 'Lambeth' committee.¹ At the time the South African Liturgical Committee had recommended;

seeking advice from the Liturgical Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with regard to the Form as a whole, together with such questions as:

- (1) The Decalogue of [sc. 'or'] the Gospel Summary of the Law
- (2) Seasonal sentences at the Offertory
- (3) Prayer at the offering of the bread and wine
- (4) Addition[al] of a Memorial of Creation to the invariable Preface
- (5) A Fraction at the Our Father
- (6) The rubric governing a further Consecration where necessary
- (7) Addition of a Prayer to the Holy Trinity before the Blessing. ²

Bazeley had advocated the seeking of such advice as early as March 1921, when he wrote, that it was to be hoped that, 'the Archbishop's committee will tell us what is most important, what is less important, and what is positively undesirable.'³ Yet, in spite of the resolutions of Episcopal Synod, there is no clear evidence that either the 1922 or the 1923 edition of the Alternative Form was ever sent to the 'Lambeth' committee. And if either was sent, there is no evidence that the committee ever gave an answer. Frere quite clearly thought, in December 1922 (when there would have been a whole year for the first resolution of the Episcopal Synod to have been put into effect) that the South African rite had never been submitted to the 'Lambeth' committee.⁴ At that date there would not have been time for the edition of 1923 (i.e. the rite as amended by Episcopal Synod in November 1922) to have been sent to England, and it is just possible that the earlier edition was kept back till it could be sent with the later one. It would certainly be extraordinary if the bishops' resolutions

1. Supra, p. 168

2. Report of the Liturgical Committee, Nov. 1921, and cf. Church Chronicle, Vol. XVIII, p. 396. A prayer addressed to the Trinity is amongst the post-communion collects of the final form.

3. Theology, Vol. II, p. 162.

4. cf. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere, p. 235.

had never been carried out at all; yet it is quite clear that, whether Phelps sent the copies to England or not, no reply reached this country before the liturgy was approved by Provincial Synod in 1924. Less than a year elapsed between the printing of the 1923 edition and the final revision of the Alternative Form. No record of any reply from the archbishop of Canterbury's committee is to be found in the minutes of the one session of the Episcopal Synod which took place in the interval. Nor has any answer been kept amongst the papers of the Liturgical Committee. Such an important document was almost bound to leave some trace. It is just possible that a reply was received at a much later date; if so, and it does not seem likely, it can have had no effect upon the South African rite.

The Episcopal Synod met to review the form for the last time early in November 1923. They rescinded a good many of the experimental amendments made in the previous year. It seems extraordinary that, when the form had received widespread support after the compromise on the invocation, the bishops should have embarked upon the edition of 1923 at all. Probably they were anxious that it should not be said that they had ignored the suggestions made in the Natal and Pretoria draft rites. Probably the bishops were not whole-hearted in desiring the sort of amendments proposed in 1923, and certainly the more radical of those amendments were unacceptable in the Province. The omission of the first Lord's Prayer, for instance, seems to have been altogether too blatant a break with Anglican tradition. It was restored in the final form and so, with some additions from the 'Grey Book'¹, was the 1919 version of the Prayer for the Church. The offertory prayer, the seasonal offertory sentences, the second fraction,

¹ Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p. 756. This is one of the rare instances in which English revision affected the South African form. For the most part the 'Grey', 'Green', and 'Orange' Books were published too late to have much influence.

and the versicle and response after the Communion, were the features of the experimental edition of 1923 which were retained in the final form. Such slight changes as had been made in the anaphora for 1923 were rescinded again for 1924,¹ and the bishops' preface was reprinted unaltered in the final edition of the Alternative Form.²

The next move in the ratification of the liturgy lay with the Provincial Registrar who towards the end of 1924 published a solemn and official definition of the canonical powers of Provincial Synod in matters of revision and gave warning that if Synod passed the new rite it would become a part of Church law and would have to be observed by the clergy under their oath of obedience and their declarations.³ Synod met in November. Phelps, still bishop of Grahamstown, 'moved in a most lucid speech that a general consent be given to the Alternative Form. ... After a full discussion this was agreed to with only one dissentient.'⁴ At this point a Natal clergyman,⁵ moved a resolution expressing loyalty to the 1662 rite. This was also passed by Synod.⁶ For at any rate the next five years the form was official and could not be altered.⁷ In 1929 Provincial Synod again approved the Alternative Form, this time without there being any need for discussion at all.⁸ As it had now been passed by two successive sessions the form could only have been further amended by opening the whole

1. See appendix 6 infra for the anaphora of 1922, 1924, & 1929.

2. An Alternative Form etc., (S.P.C.K., 1924), pp. 3-7, 'Notes on the Revision' and see supra, p.

3. Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p. 420, and cf. Constitution & Canons (1950), p. 44. for the oath and declarations.

4. Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p. 792 & cf. Historical Records, p. 199.

5. The Revd. Mr. Porter, according to the Eastern Province Herald for 13 November 1924.

6. For the text of the resolution see supra, p. 17

7. See Phelps's telegram supra, p. 170

8. Historical Records, p. 292.

process again de novo. The liturgy was fixed.

The final confirmation of the rite by Provincial Synod in 1929 did not, of course, silence all criticism of it. In 1938 the Liturgical Committee received a letter from a member of the Community of the Resurrection which claimed that the two rubrics in the rite directing a 'breaking of the bread' had resulted in confusion.¹ In 1945 a correspondent from Rhodesia, obviously under great stress as a result of the war, submitted a completely new form for an anaphora, a form which has no great liturgical merit. In the same year a priest in the diocese of Bloemfontein sent in a lengthy criticism of the invocation and threatened to reopen the whole matter in Provincial Synod at the end of the year. Only the intervention of the archbishop (Dr. Darbyshire) and the practical difficulties involved² appear to have prevented him from carrying out his threat. In 1950 three students from St Paul's College submitted a further scheme for revising the liturgy which shows obvious signs of having been inspired by Dom Gregory Dix's Shape of the Liturgy.³ Of all the criticisms of the South African rite since it became part of the official use of the Province the most recent and the most publicised has been Dean Synge's, already referred to earlier in this study.⁴ Like most of the other criticisms it is directed at the invocation. It may well be

1. Another letter on the same point was received in 1945. There is no real need for confusion. Even on the 'Western' interpretation of the rite, the first 'breaking' comes before consecration is complete, it is part of the commemoration of the passion and institution. There is only one Fraction of the consecrated host.

2. 1945 was the year in which the whole Prayer Book was approved.

3. In 1950 the Book was approved a second time so the students' scheme was understandably ignored.

4. Supra, p. 138 Dean Synge's article is a series of amusing and trenchant remarks on the Province as a whole. Its value as a serious study of the liturgy may be assessed from the following remark; 'The parts of the revision that have been made most recently can the most readily stand scrutiny. This is not entirely due to the fact that latterly the Liturgical Committee included others than Bishops'. In fact it cannot be at all due to this. Non-episcopal members were first appointed in 1945 the year the Book was first passed. It was passed again without material amendment at the second successive session of Provincial Synod, in 1950. (¶ p. III.)

that the real root of the hostility aroused by the South African second invocation is that the rite is not committed to any one particular school of 'churchmanship', for in its wording the anaphora is unquestionably the result of compromise - and not of one compromise only, but of a series of continual adjustments between different views.

Three things have made South African revision a process of accommodation. First; revision has been planned to achieve uniformity. It is true that the uniformity aimed at has always been one which has allowed a choice between two alternative rites,¹ but, with this modification, one of the aims has been a uniform use within the Province. The Anglican Church, with the emphasis which it lays upon its national character,² is perhaps particularly prone to emphasise national uniformity. The Book of 1662, itself an appanage to an Act of Uniformity, was the basis of the South African revision and the norm by which the revision was to be judged.³ The South African Book is an alternative to it and is to be, used, as far as each service is concerned, as a complete alternative. Mixing of the two books in one office is explicitly excluded⁴ and so, by implication, is any serious departure from either book. It is worth noting that, since the final confirmation of the whole South African Prayer Book in 1950, the sections which permitted modifications of the 1662 Book have been withdrawn from the Canons.⁵

Secondly; the conservatism of the vast majority of Christians in matters of worship has from the first controlled revision in South Africa.⁶ The bishops in particular, at any

1. Cf. the preface to the South African Prayer Book (O.U.P., 1950)

2. Cf. Article XXXIV of the Thirty Nine Articles.

3. Constitution and Canons, (1950), p. 12. And, of course, the 1662 rite was, in a sense, two alternative rites depending on the use or omission of the Prayer of Oblation.

4. With one important exception, see infra, p. 193

5. Supra, p. 18n. In practice, however, there is some unauthorised departure from both rites. Probably 1662 is nowhere used in its entirety for the Eucharist.

6. See chapter one, supra, p. 34

rate in the early days, favoured as little change as possible. It was, perhaps, inevitable that the events which accompanied the disestablishment of the Church should make conservatism such a powerful factor in South African liturgical history. To this factor we owe the continuance of 1662 as the primary official rite of the Province and the fact that so few of the congregational parts of the services have been altered in the alternative book.

Thirdly; there was, of course, a large body of opinion which desired revision of some kind, but which was not agreed as to what it should involve. Such a division of opinion was bound to result in a revision which would be a process of perpetual compromise and adjustment.¹ The only alternative would have been an absolute domination of revision by one man. In South Africa the course of disestablishment had made constitutional synodical government necessary; and in a Church governed by assemblies of elected persons liturgical absolutism was out of the question.

It has already been shown that in the first stages two quite distinct models were exhibited as the norm to which the eucharistic rite should conform. There was W.C. Bishop's pattern for the anaphora, towards which Bazeley and Gould and the Grahamstown group continually worked. In this view the anaphora ought to have been a prayer of thanksgiving enumerating all God's great acts of salvation wrought upon man, and including certain features subsequently introduced into the pattern; - the narrative of the Institution, the Oblation, and the Invocation.² As against this there was the view of bishop Frere which, when considerations of conservatism weighed most with the South African bishops, supplied them with the best scheme for amending the eucharistic liturgy. Frere's pattern

1. See Dix on the relationship between the Roman and Gallican rites in Shape of the Liturgy (2nd. Ed.), pp. 578ff. and Maxwell on Calvin in Outline of Christian Worship, pp. 117ff.

2. Cf. 'Certain phrases and ideas, such as oblation, have become universal, and a place must be found for them on pain of appearing to despise the Church of Christ.' - Proposals, p. 1.

was not a pattern of thanksgivings. He saw the anaphora, rather, as being constructed round three main verbs;- 'to thank' (corresponding in Anglican liturgies with the commemoration of the passion and, therefore, with the institution narrative), 'to offer', and 'to request' (i.e. the invocation).¹ Such a view of the anaphora means, when it is applied to the revision of the Anglican Prayer Book, taking the 1662 prayer of consecration and adding to it certain 'features' of catholic or primitive provenance. The Alternative Form of 1919 shows the kind of anaphora Frere had in mind.² By the time the first Alternative Form was issued advocates of both these patterns were represented on the South African Liturgical Committee. Phelps, the admirer of Proposals, was convener, and the other most prominent member of the committee was bishop Nash, a member of Frere's community. In general terms it is probably fair to say that while the underlying theology of the rite was that implied by W.C. Bishop's hypothesis, the method of revision and the details of it were those provided by Frere. It was inevitable that this should be so. Both the conservatism of the bishops and the stress which had been laid upon the Book of Common Prayer as a source of Anglican unity by successive Lambeth conferences, made it most unlikely that so radical a departure from Anglican tradition as the anaphora of Proposals should ever be adopted.³

It would be a mistake, of course, to regard these two patterns as mutually exclusive. It is obvious that, though the rite of 1919 represented the high-water mark of Frere's influence, Bazeley and Gould welcomed it as a great advance in the right direction.⁴ Frere's view of the proper frame-

1. Frere - The Primitive Consecration Prayer, p.12 & cf. Dix, a severe critic of Frere, in Shape of the Liturgy, pp.209ff.
2. See appendix 3 infra, and cf. Arnold's reconstruction of Frere's suggested anaphora in Anglican Liturgies, p.195.
3. For the Lambeth resolutions see Prayer Book Revision in the C.of E., pp.43ff. The earlier resolutions are reflected in the South African constitution see Constitution & Canons(1950), p.7f.
4. Supra, pp. 173 ff.

work for the anaphora differs from W.C.Bishop's chiefly in that it places thanksgiving, offering, and invocation on an equality; whereas Bishop regards thanksgiving as the central and dominating theme into which the other ideas have been inserted. To the authors of Proposals Frere's pattern for the anaphora was a secondary logical pattern which had come to be superimposed upon the thanksgivings.¹ And Frere clothed his framework in more conservative language and desired to use a more gradual method of revision than was suggested in Proposals, but there remains the point of contact. It was possible to regard Frere's pattern as the primitive pattern of thanksgiving overlaid by 'ideas and phrases, such as oblation, [which] have become universal'² and may not be despised. It must be frankly admitted that Frere's was much the strongest single influence upon the rite, at any rate up to 1919, and that the anaphora of the Alternative Form of that year might have taken very much the shape it did without the publication of Proposals, yet in the preface to that very rite the bishops of the Province stressed the two fundamental points made in Proposals- thanksgiving and logical order.

After 1919, however, with Provincial Synod requesting a further consideration of the rite, the influence of Frere declined. Since the desire to achieve some sort of uniformity in the province was one of the underlying principles of revision it was essential that the revised form should be generally accepted. In the face of the opposition from those, like Mr Armstrong, who desired no departure from 1662,³ and from those, like Canon Darragh, who felt that the new form was insufficiently 'Western',⁴ the bishops were almost bound to make some concessions. Though this is nowhere stated

1. Supra, p. 45

2. Proposals, p. 1.

3. Supra, p. 75

4. Darragh's views are stated at length in chapter five, supra.

in so many words, it would seem that the bishops were hoping to allay the fears of the first group by making the new rite a secondary alternative to 1662. In this they seem to have been successful for Provincial Synod in 1924, while it affirmed its loyalty to 1662, accepted the Alternative Form all but unanimously. The Westernisers were far more difficult to placate. By 1924 they had succeeded in having the phrase 'hallow this oblation' removed from the invocation and the 1662 form for supplementary consecration provided as an alternative to the form laid down in 1919. None of these diplomatic manoeuvres affected the interpretation placed upon the rite by the bishops. Even after the compromise of 1921 they continued to assert in their preface that the theme of the consecration prayer ought to be Thanksgiving. There is no mention in the preface of invocation and but little of the narrative of the Institution. Thanksgiving is the central and consecratory idea. However much the details of the language may have been shaped by compromise, the official interpretation of the rite was consistent. The bishops maintained throughout that the Alternative Form put into practice the belief that consecration was effected by Thanksgiving.¹ Neither Frere's influence nor the petitions from the clergy altered this official interpretation of the form.

The interpretation was official. Even though the preface may have been drafted by Phelps in the first place (which accounts for the obvious influence of W.C.Bishop)², it was not his work alone. The Liturgical Committee saw his draft and at least one of them, bishop Baines, made alterations to it. Episcopal Synod adopted this preface and caused it to be

1. In 1921 the bishops were still thinking in terms of a series of thanksgivings - cf. their plan to ask the 'Lambeth' committee for advice on a memorial of creation. (Supra, p. 182).

2. Cf. paragraph 3(1) of the preface with 'In all four accounts that have come down to us we are told that Our Lord did three things with ~~the~~ bread; (a) he 'blessed' it, (b) he brake it, and (c) he distributed it.' (Bishop in C.Q.R. Vol. LXVI, p. 387.

reprinted in the editions of 1920, 1922, and 1924. That they did so deliberately, and not carelessly or by accident, may be proved by reference to their statement on the compromise over the invocation, in which they formally resolved that they believed consecration to be effected by thanksgiving and not by any particular part of the consecration prayer.¹ The bishops were not only the revisers of the rite, they were responsible for the authoritative publication of it. And when they had published it, Provincial Synod gave its sanction to their form. The bishops' preface was printed in the edition of the rite Provincial Synod confirmed in 1924 and 1929 - and Synod passed the rite 'as printed'.² The idea in the mind of W.C. Bishop and expressed in an obscure article in the Church Quarterly Review half a century ago, became the mind, not only of the framers of the rite, but of the bishops who 'set it forth', and of the Province which sanctioned it.

The rite is accused of being muddled in its form of consecration.³ But these objections are only valid if one holds that the rite possesses, what the bishops maintained that it did not possess, a moment of consecration. There can

1. Supra, p. 167 . At the same time the bishops were also determined to retain the invocation because it was a commemoration of the Holy Spirit in its proper place in the pattern.
 2. See Phelps's telegram, supra, p. 170 . The members of the Synod would also have seen the bishops' more explicit statement referred to in the previous footnote.
 3. Cf. letters written to the Liturgical Committee, (supra, pp. 185A) and Dean Syngé's article (supra, pp. 138-135). Even Frere, though not in direct connection with the S.A. rite, described 'Hear us, O merciful Father..' as an 'intruded novelty' which 'broke up the continuity of the rite. (The Anaphora, p. 199.) Cf. the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon Report, Principles of Prayer Book Revision (p. 45) on the 'redundancy' of the S.A. canon. But cf. '...one would be grateful if the stately exordium of the Prayer of Consecration that the South African Church has adopted could be taken over into our own. Indeed I could wish that further draft had been made on this source.' C.H. Turner quoted by Nash in Church Chronicle, Vol. XX, p. 72. See also Maxwell-Outline of Christian Worship, pp. 151n. & 157. The S.A. phrase, 'to take our nature upon Him' has been taken over into the Indian Liturgy (Arnold-Anglican Liturgies, p. 144.) the Ceylon rite, and the rite of South India (see Garrett - Liturgy of the Church of South India, p. 64.), in the 'Grey Book', and by Hardman in his Prayer Book for 1949.

be no objection to two invocations unless one believes that consecration is effected by one of them alone. There can be no objection to the language of the second invocation unless one believes that consecration is completed by the words of Institution alone, or by those words and the first invocation. If one is prepared to leave aside the idea of a 'moment of consecration' then those things which might seem muddled, unnecessary, or untheological are seen to express a very clear theology - a theology which held that 'when thanksgiving has been offered in prayerful trust that God's power will accomplish his purpose, we then can securely believe in the Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist...'¹ Not all liturgical scholars have felt that the South African rite is muddled and obscure.² Srawley, while obviously unhappy about the two invocations, is much more cautious than some South African critics have been, and draws a parallel on this point with some of the Mozarabic masses.³ Canon Lowther Clarke's views are similar to those of the South African bishops. 'For myself,' he wrote, 'I prefer the view that the Prayer of Consecration as a whole effects Consecration.'⁴ Holding this view, he goes on to say;

But I see the force of the objection that since 1552 Consecration has been identified in English minds with the Words of Institution, and that to throw doubt on this is most disturbing. Those who lament the maimed Canon of 1662 ought not to be told that they must continue as they are or else accept what seems to them an Eastern view of Consecration. The modification which would unite the Anglican Communion most would be one on American or South African lines.

After commenting briefly on the American form of the invocation and claiming that the South African form is even better, Lowther Clarke continues;

The difficulty about the form of reconsecration would then

1. See supra, p. 167

2. See also views quoted in footnote on previous page.

3. in Liturgy and Worship, p. 348.

4. Article in Theology Reprints, No. 12. - The 1549 Canon (reprinted from Theology for February 1933), p. 11.

disappear; but to obviate all possible scruples it would be well to add a rubric that it is sufficient to use the 1662 words.

These comments show that a scholar holding the same theology of consecration as the South African bishops arrived at the same solution of the problem. In the article from which these extracts have been quoted Lowther Clarke was attempting to find some way of expressing his own theology without alienating those who held a rather different view. This is exactly the same problem as the South African bishops had to face. Lowther Clarke's solution is to adopt a form such as the bishops adopted in this country, even in the case of a second consecration. This suggests that the rite devised by the South African bishops is not the result of compromise for the sake of compromise but is exactly the form likely to be framed by those who hold a definite and clear theology of a particular kind, when faced with particular problems.

Two points only might be used to argue that the bishops were not framing the rite upon the theology which has been attributed to them - the rubrics directing the manual acts, and the rubric on supplementary consecration. Both these two points might conceivably be used to show that the South African rite was to be interpreted in terms of a 'Western' theology of consecration. (Since the compromise of 1921 no one could maintain that the rite was Eastern in this respect.) But we have already seen that the rubrics directing the manual acts are unsatisfactory evidence for proving anything, and Lowther Clarke's remarks suggest that, if anything, the rubric on supplementary consecration proves that the bishops held neither the Eastern nor the Western view of consecration. It is interesting to note that he advocated adopting 'a rubric that it is sufficient to use the 1662 words', for this is exactly what the South African bishops had done. They directed that the priest was either to use the whole consecration prayer again from the beginning of the first invocation to the end

of the second; or he is to use the 'Form provided for this purpose in the Book of Common Prayer'. It is to be noted that although the bishops are at pains to copy out the exact words to be used in the first case, they do not do so in the second. When in 1918 the bishops simply wished to use the words of 1662 they copied the rubric exactly. But the alternative form for supplementary consecration in the South African rite is specifically not this or that form of words singled out from that rite but the form used in the rite of 1662. It is not the words used, as such, which matter. The words are in the South African rite still yet they are not referred to except under the title of the first official rite of the Province - the rite of 1662. What the rubric says, in effect, is 'or you may use the form for supplementary consecration from our other Prayer Book.' No doubt this alternative was inserted in tenderness to 'those who find in the recital of the words of institution the central moment of the service;¹ and for the convenience of busy priests with large numbers of communicants,² yet the way in which the rubric has been phrased makes it evident that the bishops were not muddling³ but were making a concession which did not conflict with their clear and coherent theology. The rubric is simply an extension of the principle recognised throughout revision that the rite of 1662 is 'a sufficient and completely catholic rite'⁴ and that the two Prayer Books are alternative not

1. Gould in Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, p. 756, and cf. Lowther Clarke, op. cit., p. 12.

2. Some African churches do not possess a chalice or flagon large enough to hold sufficient wine to communicate their regular congregations.

3. Compare, for example, the real muddling and mixing of the rite of the Catholic Apostolic Church (The Liturgy and Other Divine Offices of the Church) which has the Sursum corda and a 'Preface' modelled on the anaphora of the Apostolic Constitutions, followed by the Lord's Prayer in the place where it is usually found at the end of an anaphora. But then comes a new heading, 'The Consecration', consisting of two prayers. The first is an invocation, in Eastern terms, over the bread alone, followed by the first part of the words of Institution (complete with manual acts); the second is a similar invocation over the cup and the second half of the words of Institution. 'After the Consecration' follows a form of anamnesis and oblation.

4. Resolution of Provincial Synod - 1924.

exclusive or contradictory; though it is also an exception to the other fundamental principle that the rites of the two books must not be intermingled but each must be used in its entirety. It is not the purpose of this study to examine the rationale of the consecration prayer of 1662. It is with the fact of that rite that we are concerned, a rite which is canonical and which is in use in this Province. Our concern is to interpret the meaning of the Alternative Form and that can only be done in terms of the expressed intentions of the men who framed it, of the bishops who issued it, and of the Province which sanctioned and uses it. The rubric on supplementary consecration does not contradict, but, properly understood, confirms their expressed intentions.

The bishops' theology of consecration was that the whole of the Great Thanksgiving is the consecratory 'form'. So far as it is possible to show what their eucharistic doctrine, in a wider sense, was this, too, can be seen to presuppose such a theology of consecration. The bishops regarded the idea of 'offering' or 'sacrifice' as the central theme in all eucharistic theology. Twice in the short preface to the Alternative Form they expound the meaning of the rite in terms of offering. Set out consecutively these parts of the preface give a brief but adequate exposition of the rite and an exposition which makes it clear how central was the belief that consecration is effected by thanksgiving. The language of the preface was enormously compressed and for a full understanding of its implications it is necessary to add comments and references to the sources from which the bishops drew some of their ideas. The relevant parts of the preface read;

It is important to bring out the fact that the Service of the Holy Communion is the great Thanksgiving or Eucharist of the Church. In the four accounts of the Institution

the giving of thanks by Our Lord is as important a feature as the breaking of the bread or the words of administration. The Services which have come down to us from the early centuries of Christianity, as well as those in use in the Churches of our Communion in America and Scotland, show by their structure that, if the example of Our Lord is to be followed and we are to 'Do this in remembrance of' Him, the note of Thanksgiving must be sounded more clearly than in the Book of 1661(our present Book).

This note of Thanksgiving has always been represented in Christian Liturgies by the Preface .. leading up to the Sanctus ... But in our Service after that point this note is not heard again till after the Communion, whereas in the older Services the chief facts of Our Lord's Life and Work are made the subject of Thanksgiving.

In this revised Service the whole of the central portion from the Preface to the Lord's Prayer has been, by some very few alterations, thrown into a definitely eucharistic form.

This revision of the Service in the direction of more definite thanksgiving, helps to bring out the fact that the Eucharist has a Godward side as being the offering to God of a corporate act of worship and praise. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York in their reply (1897) to the attack

-
1. The English translation of the archbishops' reply runs:
..we truly teach the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice.
.....But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the holy Eucharist - while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ - to signify the sacrifice that is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memorial of the precious death of Christ, who is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to his precept, until his coming again. For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblation of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice.
- The archbishops went on to draw a parallel between this scheme of sacrifice and the implications of the language of the Roman canon. The offering in that rite is (1) of praise and thanksgiving; (2) the pleading of Christ's sacrifice coupled with a prayer that the elements may become Christ's Body and Blood; (3) the offering to God of his own 'gifts and boons'; and (4) the prayer that offerers and offering alike may be carried up to the heavenly altar. It is clear that by 'sacrifice of thanksgiving' the archbishops meant a good deal more than would be accomplished by the reciting of the General Thanksgiving, or even by the solemn singing of the Te Deum. (see Anglican Orders (The Archbishops' Reply), pp. 35ff. and cf. Brillioth - Eucharistic Faith and Practice (Eng. Tr.), pp. 283f.)

made by the Pope on our status as a Church, emphasised this fact. Thanksgiving lifts us up in thought to God in Heaven, where the whole Church offers its worship continually. The present revision concentrates attention more upon the heavenly sphere where the worship of God is accomplished, than upon the earthly altar which is the symbol of the true, and the offering made in the Eucharist is seen to be that of the whole Church and not simply of the Celebrant.¹

At the same time the necessity of personal devotion and the reality of the personal gift in the Sacrament of the Holy Communion are maintained unimpaired.

.....
Thus the order of thought in the revised Service is as follows:-

First by Confession and Absolution the congregation is prepared for the supreme act of worship.

Then, in the Preface, Sanctus and Prayer of Consecration, no longer interrupted by the Prayer of Humble Access, we lift up our hearts in an unbroken act of Praise and Thanksgiving.

And having completed this offering with the Lord's Prayer, we then prepare ourselves for the reception of the Holy Gifts by acknowledging our unworthiness and praying that our communion may be for the benefit of our bodies

1. This sentence is, in part, an adaptation of a quotation from Frere which had been included in the preface to the Proposed Form of 1918. The earlier preface ran;

The lack of Thanksgiving in our present service has had the further result of obscuring the Godward aspect of the Eucharist as a corporate act of Worship, and has concentrated attention upon 'the altar rather than on the heavenly action; the consecration seems the work of the Celebrant to the exclusion of the offering Church'. (Frere).

Though the preface did not say so, the quotation is from Frere's Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, p.193. In the original it is clear that Frere regards the offering of the 'Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving' as accomplished upon the heavenly altar. The implication that consecration is effected by the Church's offering is not just chance. Frere seems to see consecration as accomplished just because offerer and offering are both caught up into the heavenly sphere, - not by conversion, as it were, of Christ into bread and wine, but by the taking up of the elements into God. So offering and consecration are identical or simultaneous acts. That was why he objected so strongly to the idea that the Celebrant effected consecration and by the words of Institution alone. Frere made this point very clear in his review of the 1919 form. (Supra, p. 107) It is a point which seems to have been taken by the South African bishops. When in 1922 the offertory prayer was added to the rite for the first time, that was the point in the service at which the ideas of 'blessing' and 'offering' first appeared, in spite of the fact that the heading CONSECRATION did not come till just before the Sursum corda. Bishop Gore Browne of Kimberley (see supra, p. 180) pencilled a note in his copy of the service form, 'The beginning of sacrifice'. So firmly fixed had the idea become that 'offering' and 'consecration' were identical. It is worth noting also that bishop Chandler apparently thought of the invocation of 1919 as a prayer for the blessing of the act of offering. (See supra, pp. 118f.)

and souls.¹

.....
In the Prayer for the Church Militant we are reminded that we approach God's throne not as individuals but as members of the mystical Body of Christ Our Lord.²

.....
The reunion of the Prayer of Oblation with the Prayer of Consecration, followed by the Our Father makes it clearer:-

- (a) that we must first present Christ and His merits before God as the justification for our approach,
- (b) that we then present ourselves trusting in the merits of our Head,
- (c) that having been thus lifted up into the heavenly sphere we can say the Prayer that Christ taught us,
- (d) and last, because greatest privilege of all, receive Him Who is our Life.³

The Lord's Prayer is the greatest of all prayers, and contains in itself Worship, Intercession, Petition, Penitence, and Praise. It is therefore specially suitable as

1. Even, then, when the bishops are expounding the rite primarily in terms of reception and communion they are following the same theme. Communion is fitted into the offering of the Sacrifice of Praise.

2. The revised prayer for the Church is here shown as being a part and parcel of the whole act of offering, for it serves as a reminder that the whole Church (i.e. Christ) is offerer and, therefore, consecrator. The offerer is identified with Christ's own eternal offering of Himself in 'the heavenly sphere' because Thanksgiving lifts him up into that sphere. But, because Christ is the Head of the Church, the offerer is elevated not as an individual but as part of the corporate Body. (See also note *infra*, on Lord's Prayer).

3. This passage, and the earlier one which so strongly emphasised the idea of 'offering', led bishop Baines to comment, (see *supra*, pp. 66-104 f.) 'Taken together, is not the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist somewhat "camouflaged"? Also is not the statement that "No change is made in the doctrine of our Church" open to criticism on the ground that, while it may be true that no such change is made, there is a considerable alteration made in the prominence given respectively to the sacrifice and to the communion.'

The claim that no change had been made in doctrine was part of the preface to the Proposed Form of 1918 and Phelps had intended to repeat it in the preface for 1919. It was, however, omitted eventually and another paragraph on the doctrine of the rite substituted for it. (see *infra*.) Phelps was deeply hurt, as his comments on Baines's notes show, by the charge of attempting to camouflage the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. Baines's very objections tend to show that the 'camouflage' cannot have been very successful. It was very plain that the bishops thought of the rite primarily in terms of 'offering' or 'sacrifice', though the sort of sacrifice of which they spoke may not have been the same as that commonly associated with the late medieval 'sacrifices of Masses.' Baines may well be right in maintaining that the Alternative Form gave a new prominence to the idea of sacrifice. The preface to that form certainly lays all its emphasis upon that aspect. (It is interesting to note that in 1919 'camouflage' must have been a very new and up-to-date word.)

as the conclusion of the solemn Prayer of Consecration, for it gathers up, in the highest form, all that has been prayed for therein.¹

The train of thought in the bishops' minds seems to have been somewhat as follows:

The principal theme of the whole Eucharist is 'offering' or 'sacrifice';

In the Anglican Church the eucharistic sacrifice is thought of as one of praise and thanksgiving;

But offering or sacrifice is not to be divorced from consecration - offering and consecration are identical; ²

Therefore consecration (like the offering) must be one of praise and thanksgiving.

So the whole of the bishops' eucharistic theology led logically to the belief that consecration is effected by a prayer of Thanksgivings.

It is interesting to note that the recent report of the Church of England Liturgical Commission has listed a number of new trends in eucharistic scholarship which have led them to desire a rather different approach to revision than was adopted in 1927/8. Among these trends much emphasis is laid upon the fact that 'We know now, in a way that was not realised in 1928, that the Eucharist has developed directly out of Jewish forms of thanksgiving, that the first Christians thought of consecration as effected by thanksgiving, and that the controversies between Eastern and Western views of consecration belong to a later, not to the earliest period.'³ The next two trends listed are; a new approach to the idea of eucharistic sacrifice, and the recovered em-

1. The inclusion of the Lord's Prayer under the heading CONSECRATION, which Brightman so disliked (see *supra*, p. 149 & cf. the Church of India etc., report, *Principles of Prayer Book Revision*, p. 46, on the position of the Lord's Prayer.), can only be explained in terms of the idea that consecration is effected by the Offering of Thanksgiving (or Sacrifice of Praise) which identifies the Church with Christ's offering of Himself. Seen in this light the prayer Christ taught the Church is a 'suitable conclusion to the Prayer of Consecration.'

2. Cf. Couratin - *The Sacrifice of Praise in Theology*, Vol. LVIII, No. 422, pp. 285ff.

3. *Prayer Book Revision in the C. of E.*, pp. 21f.

phasis on the corporate nature of the Eucharist - the very ideas which are to be found linked with Thanksgiving in the South African bishops' preface to the Alternative Form. Thirty years ago, when these ideas had not been so generally recognised as they are now, the bishops deliberately set out to fashion the rite round them. These are now the very ideas which it is thought desirable for any Anglican liturgy to express. It may be argued that the South African rite does not express them very well - less well, perhaps, than they were expressed in the anaphora of Bazeley and Gould's Proposals. But the bishops were restrained by the emphasis which the Lambeth Conferences and the constitution of the Province alike had laid upon the Prayer Book as a source of unity throughout the Anglican Communion.¹ The preface to the Alternative Form ends with the words;

With regard to the doctrine underlying this revised Service the Bishops are confident that it adheres, with the utmost loyalty, to 'The Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils'. (Article I of the Constitution).

Article I of the constitution also says;

The Province receives the Book of Common Prayer .. to be used, according to the form therein prescribed, in Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Holy Offices and, further, disclaims for itself the right of altering any of the aforesaid Standards....

The South African revisers could only give expression to their theology of consecration and of the Eucharist within the framework of the Book of Common Prayer and without departing from its standards.

1) Constitution & Canons (1950), Article I (pp.7f.), the second Proviso (p.8.) and Article X (p.12.). and cf. Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England, pp.29f., 35, & 42ff.

Appendix 1.

The Text of the Anaphora of the Proposals of 1913.

(After the Sursum Corda)

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places, praise thee, worship thee, and give thanks unto thee, O Lord

(upon the Feast of Trinity only)

Almighty, everlasting God, who art one God, one Lord; not one only Person, but three Persons in one substance. For that which we believe of the glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality. Therefore...

(Daily except on Trinity Sunday)

holy Father, of whom all fatherhood in heaven and earth is named; Almighty King, the author and giver of all good things; everlasting God, the same yesterday, today and forever; who didst create all things visible and invisible, through thine only begotten Son; who givest life and grace and wisdom through thy Holy Spirit:

(Upon the Feasts of Saints)

Who in the multitude of thy Saints hast compassed us about with so great a cloud of witnesses, that we, rejoicing in their fellowship, may run with patience the race that is set before us, and together with them receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away. Therefore..

(Upon the Feast of Michaelmas)

Who didst before all things create the Cherubim and Seraphim; the Angels and Archangels; who ever stand before thee, to serve and to adore, singing with perpetual praises the majesty of thy glory; with whom we too would laud and magnify thy glorious name; evermore...

(Except on Michaelmas)

for all these things and for all thy gifts, known to us and unknown, we give thanks unto thee, O Father, with the Son and the Holy Spirit. Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name; evermore...

(Daily)

evermore praising thee, and saying,
Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord most high. Amen.
For thou art indeed most high and most holy; and we bless thee and we thank thee, who art the giver of all holiness, for that thou, having made man after thine image, didst not when he fell forsake him, but didst call and teach Him by the Law and the Prophets; and when the fullness of time was come thou of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ;

(Upon the Feasts of Christmas and the Epiphany, and of the Blessed Virgin Mary)

to be born for us, who, by the operation of the Holy Spirit was made very man, of the substance of the blessed Virgin Mary his mother, and that without spot of sin, to make us clean from all sin.

(Otherwise)

to take our nature upon him and to restore thine image in mankind;

(Appendix 1 - continued)

(Daily)

Who lived and worked among men, and suffered death upon the cross for our redemption; for he made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memorial of that his precious death, until his coming again.

For, in the same night that he was betrayed, he took Bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body, which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper, he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my Blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. Amen.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the blessed Passion and precious Death of thy dear Son

(From Easter-day to the Eve of the Ascension)

Do hereby make, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial he commanded us to make; offering to thee our thanks and praise for his glorious Resurrection: for he is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world; who, by his death, hath destroyed death, and by his rising to life again, hath restored to us everlasting life.

(From Ascension-day to the Eve of Pentecost)

Do hereby make, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial he commanded us to make; offering to thee our thanks and praise, through the same thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ Our Lord; who after his most glorious Resurrection manifestly appeared to all his apostles, and in their sight ascended up into heaven, to prepare a place for us; that where he is, thither we might also ascend, and reign with him in glory.

(Upon Whit-sunday, and seven days after)

Do hereby make, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial he commanded us to make; offering thee our thanks and praise, through the same thy Son Jesus Christ Our Lord; according to whose most true promise, the Holy Spirit came down from heaven, with a sudden great sound, as it had been a mighty wind, in the likeness of fiery tongues, lighting upon the Apostles, to teach them, and to lead them into all truth; giving them both many excellent gifts, and also boldness with fervent zeal, constantly to preach the Gospel unto all nations; whereby we have been brought out of darkness and error, into the clear light and true knowledge of thee, and of thy Son Jesus Christ.

(Otherwise)

his mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension, and looking for his coming again in power and great glory, do offer unto thee thine own holy gifts; rendering unto thee our thanks and praise through thine only Son Jesus Christ; and making here, before thy divine Majesty, the memorial which he hath commanded us to make.

(Daily)

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy great goodness send forth thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these thy creatures of Bread and Wine; that he, the very

(Appendix 1 - continued)

Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, who descended upon Our Lord Jesus Christ at his Baptism, and who was poured out upon the Apostles at Pentecost, may hallow these oblations, and make this Bread the Body of thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of thy Christ: so that all who are partakers of this holy Communion may obtain remission of their sins and all other benefits of his passion.

And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church, in paradise and on earth, may enjoy everlasting felicity in the light of thy countenance. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ Our Lord; by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

As our Saviour Jesus Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say,

Our Father

(Note - the way in which the prayer was set out in the original has been slightly altered here to make it simpler to follow.)

Appendix 2.

The Text of the Anaphora of the Proposed Form of 1918

(After the Bursum Corda)

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.

(Here shall follow the Proper Preface

Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord most High. Amen.

(When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Winehe shall say the Prayer of Consecration as followeth.)

All glory and thanksgiving be to thee, O Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him, and to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again; Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of Bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood: who in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread: and, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying Take, eat, this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Like wise after supper he took the Cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this: for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. Amen.

(Note that in the original text references were given at the points here marked * to the rubrics printed as in 1662 in the margin and directing the performance of the manual acts.)

(After shall be said as followeth.)

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the blessed passion and precious death, the mighty resurrection and glorious ascension of thy dear Son, and looking for his coming again with power and great glory, entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee that thy Holy Spirit may be poured upon us, and that all we who are partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and

(Appendix 2 - continued)

Blood of thy Son, and may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

As our Saviour Jesus Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say:

(Then shall the Priest say the Lord's Prayer, the people repeating after him every petition.)

Our Father

Appendix 3.

The Text of the Anaphora of the first Alternative Form of 1919

(The rubric about ordering the Bread and Wine is printed before the Sursum Corda.)

(After the Sursum Corda.)

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.

(Here shall follow the Proper Preface)

Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name, evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord most High Amen.

All Glory and Thanksgiving be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him, and to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again. Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood: who in the same night that he was betrayed, ^①took Bread; and, when he had given thanks, ^②he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, ^③this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper ^④he took the Cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this ^⑤is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, do render unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; and, looking for his coming again with power and great glory, we offer here unto thy divine majesty these sacred gifts and creatures of thine own, this holy Bread of eternal life and this Cup of everlasting salvation; and we humbly beseech thee to pour thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts, that he may hallow this oblation, and that all we who are partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.

And we earnestly desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living

(Appendix 3 - continued)

sacrifice unto thee:

And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

And now as our Saviour Jesus Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say:

(Then shall the Priest say the Lord's Prayer, the people repeating after him every petition.)

Our Father

(Note:- ② indicates the position of the manual acts as in 1662.)

Appendix 4.

The Text of the Anaphora of the Prætorian Draft Rite of 1921

(Note that in the original the anaphora is not printed in full. The text of the 1662 prayer is taken as the basis of it and only the variations from that prayer are indicated.)

(After the Sursum Corda)

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord most Holy, Father Almighty, Everlasting God.

(Here shall follow the Proper Preface ...)

Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest.

(The Priest shall immediately continue - the People all kneeling.)

Holy indeed, and Blessed indeed art thou, O Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to take our nature upon him and to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, the memorial of that his precious death, until his coming again: Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood: who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took Bread; and, when he had given thanks, brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the Cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in devout remembrance the blessed Passion and precious Death, the mighty (triumphant) Resurrection and glorious Ascension of thy dearly-beloved Son, and looking for his Coming again with power and great glory, entreat thee that thy Holy Spirit may descend upon us, and upon this oblation of the Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that all we who are partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive

(Appendix 4 - continued)

the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.

And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

(Then shall be sung or said the Lord's Prayer by the Priest and People together, the Priest first saying.)

Let us pray. As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say,
Our Father

Appendix 5.

The Text of the Anaphora of the Natal Draft Rite of 1921

(After the Sursum Corda)

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Holy Lord, Father Almighty, Everlasting God, who hast created all things. (Here shall follow the Proper Preface ...) Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee, and saying:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts: heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: Glory be to Thee, O Lord most high. Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest. Amen.

(Then shall follow immediately the Prayer of Consecration:)

All Glory and Thanksgiving be unto Thee, Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that Thou of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon Him, and to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memorial of that His precious Death, until His coming again.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and graciously send down Thy Holy Spirit upon these Thy creatures, that He may make this bread the precious Body, and this wine the precious Blood of Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, according to His holy institution - who, in the same night that He was betrayed took bread, and when He had given thanks [Ⓢ]He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat; [Ⓢ]This is My Body which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise after supper He [Ⓢ]took the cup; and, when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for [Ⓢ]This is My Blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me. AMEN.

(Note: The whole of this prayer from 'All Glory...' to the Amen is printed throughout in capital letters. [Ⓢ] indicates the rubrics directing the manual acts as in 1662)

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants, having in remembrance His blessed Passion and precious Death, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; and looking for His coming again with power and great glory, do offer here unto Thy Divine Majesty these Sacred Gifts, this holy Bread of eternal life and this Cup of everlasting salvation: and we humbly beseech Thee to pour Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these Sacred Mysteries of Christ's Body and Blood, to the intent that we may fruitfully receive the same, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction. Amen.

And we entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that by the merits and Death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood we

(Appendix 5 - continued)

and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins,
and all other benefits of His Passion.

And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves,
our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living
sacrifice unto Thee.

And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins,
to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to
accept this our bounden duty and service; (Here make the
Greater Fraction, or after the Lord's Prayer) not weighing
our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ,
our Lord; by Whom, and through Whom, and with Whom, in the
unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee,
O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

Let us pray.

As our Saviour Jesus Christ hath commanded and taught us, we
are bold to say:
Our Father

Appendix 6.

The Text of the Anaphora of the final Alternative Form of 1924

(As in the Alternative Form of 1919 - see Appendix 3.- to the end of the Sanctus.)

All Glory and Thanksgiving be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him, and to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who (by his one oblation of himself once offered) made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood: who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread; and, when he had given thanks, brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the Cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, do render unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; and, looking for his coming again with power and great glory, we offer here unto thy Divine Majesty this holy Bread of eternal life and this Cup of everlasting salvation; and we humbly beseech thee to pour thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts, that all we who are partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.

And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee.

And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. (Here let all the people say: Amen)

As our Saviour Jesus Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say:
(Then shall the Priest and People say together the Lord's Prayer)
Our Father

Appendix 7.

Principal collections of documents relating to the history of the revision of the South African Eucharistic rite.

A) CAPE TOWN.

(1) Bishops Court. - Minutes of the Episcopal Synod.
(containing also copies of some of the reports of the Liturgical Committee and a copy of the Petition submitted by the European Clergy of Natal and the Considerations attached thereto.)

(2) Cape Town Diocesan Library - Church House.
Records of the Liturgical Committee.

Memorandum from W.H. Frere, C.R., D.D. entitled Rough Notes on the Proposed Form of the South African Liturgy - 1. Aug. 1918.

Report to the Bishop of Pretoria from a committee in that diocese appointed to consider Prayer Book revision - Jan. 1919.

Report of Liturgical Committee to Episcopal Synod - Feb. 1919.

Report of Liturgical Committee to Episcopal Synod - 1923

Printed editions of the Alternative Forms of 1922 & 1924.

Bazeley and Gould - Proposals for the revision of the Anaphora

Draft of suggested amendments to be presented to the Committee of Bishops. (Natal Draft Rite)

A great many documents relating to the later stages of the revision and three files of correspondence addressed to the Committee between 1930 and 1945.

(3) The South African Public Library

In addition to copies of the South African Prayer Book in its final form and the various translations of the same:

Printed editions of the Alternative Forms of 1919, 1923 & 1924

A copy of the Alternative Form of 1921 inscribed 'J.S.B. (i.e. Bazeley) d.d. - P.R.G. (i.e. Phelps)'

C.J.B. Gould - Revision of the Eucharistic Canon (reprinted from the Church Chronicle of 28 June 1917)

Bazeley and Gould - Proposals for the revision of the Anaphora

B) GRAHAMSTOWN.

(4) Saint Paul's College Library
(a) 'Bazeley Papers' given to the present writer for the College by Mrs Bazeley in 1956.

Bazeley and Gould - Proposals etc.

J.S. Bazeley - (typescript essay) The Simplicity of Divine Service in the Church of England etc.

(Appendix 7 - continued.)

J.S.Bazeley - MS. fragments - chapters II & III of a history of the eucharistic rite in the early church.

Printed editions of the Alternative Forms of 1919, 1920, 1922, 1923 & 1924.

Copy of the Alternative Form of 1919 with MS. suggestions for further revision in Bazeley's hand.

(b) The following books inscribed;

This Book was used by the Rev. J.S.Bazeley, Third Warden of St. Paul's College, in the compilation of the South African Liturgy which was shaped within the walls of this College.

Missal for the Laity (Burns & Oates Ltd.) new edition, no date.

Book of Common Prayer (America) 1929

Portescue - The Mass (Longmans) new edition, 1914.

The Scottish Liturgy 1912

Randolph - A Revised Liturgy (Mowbray) 1914

A Prayer Book Revised (Mowbray) undated.

The First Prayer Book of Edward VI (Griffith, Farran, Browne) undated.

(c) The library also contains, through the kindness of Mrs C.J.B.Gould and the Revd. K.E.Driver, the greater part of Canon Gould's collection of liturgical works, one of the best in the country. With these books were certain papers of value, including;

MS. letters to Canon Gould from:

The Revd. Percy Dearmer D.D. dated 16 November 1910
17 July 1911

24 January 1914

The Revd. W.C.Bishop 20 March 1914

The Rt. Revd. F.R.Phelps 14 December 1930

MS. letters from Canon Gould to Mrs Bazeley (presented

by Mrs Bazeley) 23 July 1940

23 September 1942

Original Telegrams received by Canon Gould from:

The Rt. Revd. F.R.Phelps 11 November 1919

14 November 1924

The Revd. J.S.Bazeley

11 November 1919

(d) Also in the College library is a privately bound volume containing:

Charge to the Diocese of Cape Town (Bishop Gray) 1837

Address and Pastoral Letter (do) 1857

Charge (do) 1861

Charge to the Diocese of Natal (do) 1864

Charge to the Diocese of Cape Town (do)

with Constitution, Acts and Resolutions

of the Synod of Cape Town 1865

A Letter to Members of the Church (do) 1867

Charge to the Diocese of Cape Town (do) 1870

Constitution and Canons of the Church of the

Province of South Africa with Acts of the

first Provincial Synod 1870

Statements relating to proceedings about Bishop

Colenso etc. (Bishop Gray) 1870

Letter to the Archiepiscopacy of George

(Archiepiscopacy Ednall) 1866.

These do not bear directly upon the Liturgy but were used for the historical outline given in Chapter One.

(Appendix 7 - continued)

C) JOHANNESBURG

(5) The University of the Witwatersrand -
The Central Church Record Library.

Bazeley and Gould - Proposals etc.

C.J.B.Gould - Revision of the Eucharistic Canon (reprinted
from the Church Chronicle of 28 June 1917)

Printed editions of the Alternative Forms of 1919, 1920
1923 & 1924

The Proposed Form of 1918

The Liturgy - Proof copy for further consideration etc. (Pretoria
Draft Rite)

Draft of suggested amendments to be presented to the Committee
of Bishops (Natal Draft Rite)

D) KIMBERLEY

(6) Episcopal Records of the Diocese of Kimberley and Kuruman.

The Liturgy - Proof copy for further consideration etc (Pretoria
Draft Rite)

Printed editions of the Alternative Forms of 1921 & 1923

A copy of the Alternative Form of 1921 with pencilled amend-
ations by Bishop Gore Browne.

Report of the Liturgical Committee to Episcopal Synod 1917

Report of the Liturgical Committee to Episcopal Synod 1921

Letter from The Most Revd. W.M. Carter, Archbishop of Cape
Town, to the Bishops of the Province - 1918

Digest of the reports of the Chapters of the Dioceses of
Cape Town, Grahamstown and St Johns on Report No 304 of
the Convocation of Canterbury.

Report to the Bishop of Pretoria from a committee of that
Diocese appointed to consider Prayer Book revision - Nov.1918

Report to the Bishop of Pretoria ditto - Feb.1919

Memorandum submitted to Episcopal Synod on the (English)
Prayer Book Measure of 1927 by the Revd. C.J.B.Gould.

Appendix 7 (b)The Present State of Documentary Evidence.

The principal documentary sources for the history of the rite are listed above in this appendix. It appears that Canon Gould intended, in the 1940s, to write a complete history of the South African Prayer Book. Unfortunately he died before he could achieve this aim, and no manuscript has survived amongst his papers. In the course of collecting the material for this projected work Gould wrote two letters to Mrs Bazeley, the widow of his former colleague.¹ These letters are valuable evidence and indicate the fate of a good deal of the relevant documents. Mrs Bazeley had sent Gould such of her husband's papers as still existed. Gould's own papers had been destroyed some time previously. The papers from Mrs Bazeley included some written by Dr. Darragh and a nearly complete set of the various editions of the South African rite. In 1942 Gould sent some of the papers he had collected to the Central Church Record Library, housed at the University of the Witwatersrand, and others to the South African Public Library in Cape Town, where they may still be found.² The present Bishop of Mashonaland, the Rt. Revd. C.W. Alderson, who was Warden of St. Paul's College from 1938 to 1943, recalls that Gould wrote to him at the time offering him some liturgical papers for the College library. The only trace of this transaction now to be found in the College is the collection of books inscribed as having been used by Bazeley in the preparation of the South African Liturgy.³

In the second of his letters to Mrs Bazeley (dated 23 September 1942) Gould described his attempts to locate further material. What he then wrote agrees almost exactly

1. supra p. 29 These letters are now in St. Paul's College library.

2. see list given in the first part of this appendix.

3. This inscription is for many reasons unreliable. cf. supra p. 171f.

(Appendix 7b - continued)

with the findings of the present writer whose search for material had been virtually completed by the time these two letters of Canon Gould's came to light.

Canon Gould wrote:¹

'The Bishop of Kimberley has been secretary of the Liturgical Committee ever since he took over from Francis Phelps when the latter became Archbishop.'

(That was in 1931. The Bishop of Kimberley was Theodore Gibson, subsequently bishop of St John's. He continued as secretary and later as convener of the Committee until his resignation in 1950.)

'From what Mrs Phelps tells me it seems that F.R.P. destroyed practically all his liturgical papers before he left Grahamstown in 1931; anyway he handed none worth speaking of to the Ep. of Kimberley.'

(For a list of what has been preserved by the Liturgical Committee see the earlier part of this appendix. Bishop Fisher, convener of the Committee in succession to Phelps, recalls that no minutes were kept until Bishop Gibson became secretary and that Phelps used to note amendments in an interleaved copy of the South African Rite.)

'And he left none at Bishopsbourne.'

(Bishopsbourne is the residence of the bishops of Grahamstown. The present bishop, the Rt. Revd. A.H. Cullen, D.D., who succeeded Phelps, confirms that his predecessor left no liturgical papers amongst his files.)

'Nor did he give any to Father Victor.'

(Father Cmund Victor, C.R., was, at the time when Gould wrote, Provincial Archivist, in charge of the Central Church Record Library.)

'Nor are there any at Bishops court.'

(Bishops court is the residence of the archbishops of Cape Town. The Revd. C.T. Wood, domestic Chaplain to archbishop Phelps, devoted a good deal of his time and attention to ordering the records kept at Bishops court. He confirms that there were no liturgical papers amongst these records. There is nothing relevant at Bishops court now except the minutes of the Episcopal Synod.)

'Or the Provincial Office.'

(The only papers having a bearing on liturgical revision now to be found in the Provincial Secretary's office in Church House in Cape Town are the proof sheets sent out from England when the complete Prayer Book was first published by the O.U.R. after the Provincial Synod in 1950.)

'The three bishops most active in the early stages of revision were Chandler [of Bloemfontein 1902 - 20] Williams of St Johns and Ep. Nash. [C.R. Coadjutor bishop of Cape Town.] So I wrote to Archdeacon Clarke, Chandler's biographer, to Williams's executor, and Ep. Nash at Mirfield. The first had found nothing about the S.A. Liturgy in all the papers

1. The text of Gould's letter is printed below in inverted commas. My own explanatory notes are in brackets after each clause or sentence requiring comment.

(Appendix 7b - continued)

he went through, and the two others had destroyed them all. But at Kimberley there was a file of Bp. Gore-Browne's, who was not on the Liturgical Committee, but who had kept some - at all events - of the papers he had received as a member of Episcopal Synod: and that was a really useful find.'

(These papers still exist in the files of the bishops of Kimberley - see the list in the earlier part of this appendix. They were used by the present Bishop of George, the Rt. Revd. J. Hunter, when he was at Kimberley, for a paper on the South African rite. It was through him that the present writer learnt of their existence. At George, itself, as in most other dioceses, none of the early liturgical papers have been preserved.)

In addition to the various sources mentioned by Gould in the letter quoted above, there are the records of the Liturgical Committee, now housed in the Diocesan Library in Cape Town. No minutes were kept until 1931; and none of the correspondence and only a few of the more obviously important papers were preserved before that date. After 1931, when the liturgy had already received final ratification from Provincial Synod, everything seems to have been kept, including letters from persons who were quite obviously mentally unbalanced. Amongst this very complete collection is another letter from Gould, dated 20 December 1941, in which he complains to the secretary of the Committee that he has been unable to find any liturgical papers for the period 1917 - 24 at Bishopscourt in Cape Town. This letter belongs to the same period as Gould's letters to Mrs. Bazeley and was written in the course of his search for material for a history of the rite.

The material kept at the Central Church Record Library consists chiefly of the pamphlets sent there by Gould in 1942.¹ This is true also of the documents in the South African Public Library.

The minutes of the Episcopal Synod, kept at Bishopscourt, are, where relevant at all, chiefly a formal list of resolutions proposed, adopted, or rejected, on the recommendation of the Liturgical Committee. As the minutes often refer simply to the numbers of the paragraphs in the Committee's

1. See supra two pages previously.

(Appendix 7b - continued)

reports and as not all these reports now exist, it is not always possible to determine exactly what Episcopal Synod did decide except by reference to the printed editions of the rite issued after the session of the Synod. This means that one can always discover what went into the rite, but not always what was rejected. Only constant reference to the reports would make it possible to interpret the minutes exactly, and the matter is further complicated by the fact that, whereas the minutes are kept at the archbishop's home, the reports, where these exist at all, are sometimes to be found only in a place some hundreds of miles away. Continual cross-reference and comparison is impossible. The proceedings of Episcopal Synod, moreover, are never made public (except for brief statements issued occasionally by the Synod) and the minutes could not, of course, be removed from Bishops court. Indeed, it was only through the kindness of the late archbishop, the Most Revd. Dr. Geoffrey Clayton, that this source of information was made available at all.

Some of the papers from the diocese of St Johns have been preserved by the Revd. G. Bacon, rector of Maclear. The most valuable of these is a copy of the paper read to the Society of Sacred Study in that diocese by Canon Mason.¹

Another valuable source of information is the Revd. R.C.D. Jasper's collection of the liturgical papers of bishop Frere.² Both Mr. Jasper and Father Bernard Horner, C.R., Frere's literary executor, assure me that all the papers left by the bishop which have a bearing on the South African rite were included in that collection.

In the absence of any correspondence addressed to the

1. Supra p. 115

2. Jasper - Walter Howard Frere (Alcuin Club. 1964)

(Appendix 7b - continued)

Liturgical Committee during the years in which the eucharistic liturgy was framed, the correspondence columns of the Church Chronicle, then the official journal of the Province, have proved invaluable. A full set of the bound volumes of this magazine are kept in the Diocesan Library in Cape Town. Volume XXI (1924) of the series contains an article by Canon Gould entitled The South African Liturgy,¹ a very short but illuminating account of revision up to 1924. Gould's account needs some correction in matters of detail which have been noted in the body of this study,² but the main outline is reliable. The article was written just before the present South African rite was presented to Provincial Synod for the first time.

Also by Gould, but of less value for this study, is a chapter in Historical Records on the episcopate of bishop Phelps, which refers in part to the beginnings of revision in this country. Another chapter of Historical Records is avowedly devoted to the South African liturgy, but it is very brief and consists chiefly of two extracts from The Kingdom, the magazine of the diocese of Pretoria. Some not very detailed information may also be found in Liturgy and Worship.³

1. Church Chronicle, Vol. XXI, pp. 756f.

2. supra pp. 78 & 100 n.

3. Edited. W.K. Lowther Clarke (S.I.C.K. 1932)

Appendix F.BIBLIOGRAPHYI. General Liturgical Background.

- Fate, H.N. & F.C. Eeles - Thoughts on the Shape of the Liturgy; Alcuin Club, 1946.
- Bishop, E. - Liturgica Historia; C.U.P., 1918.
- Bishop, W.C. - The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites; Alcuin Club, 1924.
- Brillioth, Y. - Eucharistic Faith and Practice; (tr. A.G. Hebert), S.P.C.K., 1930.
- Cabrol, F. - The Mass of the Western Rite; (tr. C.M. Antony), Sands & Co., 1934.
- Cirlot, F.L. - The Early Eucharist, S.P.C.K., 1939.
- Clarke, W.K. Lowther (Ed.) - Liturgy & Worship; S.P.C.K., 1932.
- Connolly, R.H. - Didascalia Apostolorum; C.U.P., 1929.
- Cullmann, O. - Early Christian Worship; S.C.M., 1953.
- Daniel - A Critical Study of Primitive Liturgies; (2nd. Ed.), T.A.M. Press, 1949.
- Dearmer, P. - The Parson's Handbook; (4th. Ed.), Grant Richards, 1902.
- The Art of Public Worship; Mowbray's, 1919.
- Dix, G. - The Shape of the Liturgy; (2nd. Ed.) Dacre Press, 1945.
- Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition; S.P.C.K., 1937.
- Dowden, J. - The Workmanship of the Prayer Book; Methuen, 1902.
- Duchesne, L. - Christian Worship; (tr. from 3rd. French Ed. by M.L. McClure), SPCK., 1903.
- Easton, B.S. - The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus; C.U.P., 1934.
- Fortescue, A. - The Mass; (2nd. Ed.), Longmans, 1914.
- Frere, W.H. - The Principles of Religious Ceremonial; Longmans, Green & Co., 1906.
- Gavin, F. - The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments; S.P.C.K., 1928.
- Heiler, F. - The Spirit of Worship; (tr. W. Montgomery), Hodder & Stoughton, 1926.
- Jeremias, J. - The Eucharistic Words of Jesus; (tr. A. Ehrhardt), Blackwell, 1955.
- Lietzmann, H. - The Mass & the Lord's Supper; (tr. D.H.G. Reeve), (4 fascicles), E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1954.
- Lockton, W. - The Remains at the Eucharist; C.U.P., 1920.
- Maclean - The Ancient Church Orders; C.U.P., 1910.
- Maxwell, W.D. - An Outline of Christian Worship; C.U.P., 1952.
- Mortimer, A.G. - The Eucharistic Sacrifice; Longmans, Green & Co., 1901.
- Neale, J. - Essays on Liturgiology; (2nd. Ed.), Sanders, Otley & Co., 1867.
- Norman, J. - Handbook to the Christian Liturgies; S.P.C.K., 1944.
- Cesterley, W.O.E. - The Jewish Background to the Christian Liturgy; C.U.P., 1925.
- Osborn, R.R. - Holy Communion in the Church of England; Lutterworth, 1949.
- Salaville, S. - An Introduction to the Study of Eastern Liturgies; (tr. J.M. Barton), Sands, 1938.
- Srawley - The Early History of the Liturgy; C.U.P. (2nd. Ed.), 1947.
- Stone, D. - History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist; (2 Vols.), Longmans, 1909.
- Swete - Services and Service Books before the Reformation; S.P.C.K., 1896.
- Warren, F.E. - Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church; S.P.C.K., 1897.

(Bibliography.)

II. Consecration and the Anaphora.

- Aquinas, Thomas - Summa Theologica; Pt. III.
 Atchley, F.C.E.G. - The Eucharistic Liturgy; Alcuin Club, 1935.
 Bishop, W.C. - The Primitive Form of Consecration; (art. in C.Q.R., Vol. LKVI, No. 132.)
 Blomfield, J. - The Eucharistic Canon; S.P.C.K., 1930.
 Brightman, F.E. - The Alternative Canon; (pamphlet), O.U.P., 1927.
 Connolly, R.H. - Liturgical Homilies of Narsai; (Texts & Studies), C.U.P., 1909.
 Frere, W.H. - The Primitive Consecration Prayer; Alcuin Club, 1922.
 The Anaphora; S.P.C.K., 1938.
 Gummy, H.R.G. - The Consecration of the Eucharist; H.F. Ammers Press, 1908.
 Hunkin, J.W. - The Invocation of the Holy Spirit; (pamphlet), Heffer & Sons, 1927.
 Lockton, W. - The Eucharistic Prayer; (art. in C.Q.R., Vol. LXXXVI, No. 172.)
 Selwyn, E.C. (Ed.) - The 1549 Canon; (pamphlet containing essays by K.D. Mackenzie & W.K. Lowther Clarke), S.P.C.K., undated.
 Simpson, W.J. Sparrow - The Prayer of Consecration; Robert Scott, 1917.
 The Eucharistic Canon; (privately printed pamphlet).
 Turner, C.F.G. - The Form of Consecration; (pamphlet), W. Knott, 1906.
 Tyrer, J.W. - The Eucharistic Eucharistic; Longmans, Green & Co., 1917.
 Wyatt, E.G.P. - The Eucharistic Prayer; Alcuin Club, 1914.

III. Anglican Liturgical History.

- Anglican Orders; (The Bull Apostolicae Curae and the Reply by the Archbishops of England), (Eng. Tr.), S.P.C.K., 1954.
 Bazeley, J.S. - Liturgical Revision in the Anglican Communion; (art. in Theology, Vol. II.)
 & C.J.B. Gould - Proposals for the Revision of the Anaphora; (privately printed pamphlet), 1913.
 Bell, C.K.A. - Randall Davidson; (2nd. Ed.), O.U.P., 1938.
 Bingham, J. - Antiquities of the Christian Church; (2 Vols.), H.G. Bohn, 1870.
 Bishop, W.C. - Prayer Book Revision: The Present Stage; (art. in C.Q.R., Vol. LXXX.)
 Brightman, F.E. - The English Rite; (2 Vols.), Rivingtons, 1915.
 Considerations bearing on the Petition to Episcopal Synod from the Clergy of Natal; (privately published pamphlet).
 Cardwell, E. - Conferences on the Book of Common Prayer; (3rd. Ed.), O.U.P., 1849.
 Davidson, R.T. - Archibald Campbell Tait; (2 Vols.), (2nd. Ed.), Macmillan & Co., 1891.
 Debate on the Revision of the Prayer Book; (House of Bishops), (National Assembly of the C. of E.), April 1923, S.P.C.K.
 Dugmore, C.W. - Eucharistic Doctrine in England; S.P.C.K., 1942.
 Donaldson, G. - The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637; Edinburgh U.P., 1954.

(Bibliography)

- Frere, W.H. - The New South African Liturgy; (art. in C.Q.R., Vol.XC, No.180.)
 Some Principles of Liturgical Reform; John Murray, 1911.
 The Reconstruction of Worship; (art. in C.Q.R., Vol. LXXV, No.149.)
- Garrett, T.S. - The Liturgy of the Church of South India; O.U.P., (2nd.Ed.),
- Gasquet & Bishop - Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer; Burns & Oates, (3rd.Ed.)
- Gould, C.J.B. - The Revision of the Eucharistic Canon; (privately printed pamphlet).
 The South African Liturgy; (art. in Church Chronicle, Vol.XXI.)
- Jasper, R.C.D. - Walter Howard Frere; Alcuin Club, 1954.
- Lockton, W. - The Proposed South African Liturgy; (art. in C.Q.R., Vol. LXXXVI, No.172.)
- Maxwell, W.D. - The Book of Common Prayer and the Worship of the Non-Anglican Churches; (Dr.Williams' Library Lectures), O.U.P., 1950.
- Parker, J. - Introduction to the Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer; Parker, 1877.
- Procter, F., & W.H.Frere - New History of the Book of Common Prayer; Macmillan, 1902.
- Principles of Prayer Book Revision; (Report on Revision in Anglican Communion), S.P.C.K., 1957. (C.I.P.B.C.Committee).
- Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England; (Memorandum of the C.of E. Liturgical Commission), S.P.C.K., 1957.
- Riley, A. - Prayer Book Revision; Alcuin Club, 1911.
- Suter, J.W., & G.J.Cleaveland - The American Book of Common Prayer; O.U.P., 1949.
- Thorndike - Works; (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology), (6 Vols.), Parker, 1844.
- Ward, J.W.C. - The High Church Schism; Faith Press, 1951.
- Wirgman, A.T. - The Prayer Book with Scripture Proofs; Bemrose & Sons, (2nd.Ed.), 1884.

IV. South African Church History.

- Constitution & Canons; (South Africa), William Foster, 1870.
 do. (1939), Church House, 1942.
 do. (1950) do. 1952.
- Constitution & Canons; (Central Africa), (cyclostyled), 1955.
- Clarke, H.Lowther, - Constitutional Church Government; S.P.C.K., 1924.
- Gray, R. - Visitation Charges etc.; (see appendix 7)
 Statement in connection with Dr. Colenso; Rivington's, (2nd.Ed.), 1867.
- Gray, C. - Life of Robert Gray; (2 Vols.), Rivington's, 1876.
- Hulme, F.H. - Blackwall to Bloemfontein; S.A.Church Publications 1950.
- Lewis, C. & G.E.Edwards - Historical Records of the Church of the Province of South Africa; S.P.C.K., 1934.
- Metrowich, F.C. - Assegai Over the Hills; N.Timmins, 1953.
- Page, H.T. - The Harvest of Good Hope; S.P.C.K., 1947.
- Pierce Jones - Procession of Witness; (privately printed), 1947.
- Wirgman, A.T. - Storm and Sunshine in South Africa; Longmans, Green & Co., 1922.
 Life of James Green; (2 Vols.), Longmans & Co., 1909.
- Wood, W.H.M. - A Father in God; Macmillan & Co., 1913.

(Bibliography)

- The Kingdom; (Monthly magazine of the diocese of Pretoria.)
Volume for 1914.
The Newsletter; (Monthly magazine of the diocese of Grahams-
town), Volume for 1918, 1919.
Theology; Vols. II, LVII.